

THE NEW EDUCATION BILL

ON August 10th Mr. Herbert Fisher, the Minister of Education, introduced his new Bill into the House of Commons and obtained the first reading for it. From the speech he made on that occasion, and the text of the Bill which is now in our hands, we can form a rudimentary estimate of its significance for our educational future. As there is no intention of pushing the Bill through its further stages until the country has had sufficient time to digest it, we of the Catholic body in England, in common with our fellow-countrymen of all classes and kinds, shall be using our opportunity during the coming months to study its bearing on ourselves, and the attitude towards it which it will be our duty to take up. Of course in determining this we shall be led by those who represent us and shall be encouraged to place our confidence in their direction by the consciousness that they have led us very skilfully through the recent years of crisis. For when we reflect on the gloomy prospects which seemed to loom in front of us when Mr. Birrell introduced his abortive Bill of a few years back and compare them with the retrospect we can now survey, although we have had to face some hardships and are still suffering under some trying disabilities, as for instance are those which hamper us in our endeavour to supply ourselves with a system of Secondary Schools, our elementary schools have undoubtedly maintained and improved their efficiency under the new regime, and we ourselves have increased that political strength and influence in the country which is our best weapon for vindicating the rights of our Catholic children.

At the present moment it would be premature to pronounce in any detail on the features of the system which the new Bill projects. One feels, in reading through its text, that it confines itself to a mass of generalities from which it is impossible to calculate with any definiteness the position in which it will be likely to place us. We do not say this in adverse criticism of the Bill. Its indefiniteness is inevitable at its present stage, for what Mr. Fisher has in mind is a system which will not be wooden, but take into account the diverse requirements of the different parts of the kingdom, and with that object he

proposes to leave to the various local authorities a large initiative in devising schemes suitable to their own territorial jurisdictions, the Education Office reserving to itself merely the power to sanction or modify the local schemes when they have been at length sent in. Thus Clause 1 of the new Bill declares that "with a view to the establishment of a national system of public education available for all persons capable of profiting thereby, it shall be the duty of the Council of every county and county borough to contribute thereto by providing for the progressive development and comprehensive organization of education in respect of their area, and with that object to submit to the Board of Education when required by the Board schemes showing the mode in which their duties and powers under the Education Acts are to be performed and exercised, whether separately or in co-operation with other authorities." "The Council of any county, before submitting a scheme under this section, shall consult the authorities having powers within their county under Part III. of the Education Act, 1902, with reference to the mode in which and the extent to which any such authority will co-operate with the Council in carrying out their scheme, and when submitting their scheme shall make a report to the Board of Education as to the co-operation which is to be anticipated from any such authority."

Clause 2 makes provision for the development of education in these public elementary schools. It prescribes that central schools, or special classes, shall be provided by these same local authorities so as to render possible the inclusion in the curriculum of public elementary schools of practical instruction (*i.e.*, in cookery, laundry work, etc.) suitable to the ages, capacities, and circumstances of the children, and for organizing courses of instruction in attendance at such schools, including children who stay at such schools beyond the age of fourteen. It prescribes also that these local authorities shall make suitable and adequate arrangements for co-operating with authorities exercising powers under Part II. of the Education Act of 1902 in matters of common interest, and particularly in respect of the preparation of children for further education in schools other than elementary, and likewise for the supply and training of teachers.

Clause 3 makes provision for continuing the education of "young persons" (defined to be "persons under eighteen years of age who are no longer children," that is no longer

below the age when "parents cease to be under an obligation to cause them to receive efficient elementary instruction"), and "helping them to prepare for the freedom and responsibilities of adult life." A system of progressive organization for such continuation schools and for the purpose of securing general and regular attendance thereat is to be devised by the same local authorities, who are to consult beforehand with such persons or bodies interested as they consider desirable.

Clause 4 provides for the power of the Board of Education to sanction, with or without modifications, the schemes thus submitted to it, and for the obligation on the local authorities to carry it out according to the terms of the sanction given.

Clause 5 provides for the establishment and incorporation of Provincial Associations for such areas as the Board may direct. This is with a view to the "better co-ordination of education and the provision of advice and assistance for the Board of Education and local educational authorities, particularly in respect of matters of common interest concerning education which it is necessary or convenient to consider in relation to areas larger than those of individual education authorities. In establishing such large bodies or associations the Board of Education may provide directly or by co-optation for the inclusion of persons interested in the administration or educational work of the area, and of representatives of universities or other bodies; and the associations thus constituted may, if they think fit, with the approval of the Board of Education, undertake any administrative and educational functions which may be delegated to them by any local educational authority within their area. Moreover, the Board of Education and likewise the local authorities comprised within the area of these provincial associations, may contribute out of Parliamentary grants or the rates towards the payment of the expenses of such delegated administration.

Clause 8 to 16 provides for the enforcement of school attendance of children up to the ages of 14 or 15 in areas where the local authorities, with the sanction of the Board of Education, require this; and of young persons from the completion of the school age up to the age of 18, or 16 for those then able to show sufficient evidence that they have attained already to a certain educational standard, or are otherwise in course of competent educational training. These clauses also provide for the number of hours and the year at which attendance at the continuation schools is obligatory,

and also for the limitation of the employment of the young persons requisite that they may be free for such attendance and in a fit state to profit by the training given them, an obligatory limitation imposed under penalty of suitable fines alike on parents, employers, and the young persons themselves.

To pass over subsidiary prescriptions we must note particularly, as an essential feature in the new system, Clause 19, which imposes on the local education authorities the obligation of "supplying or aiding the supply of nursery schools for children over two and under five years of age . . . whose home conditions are such that attendance at such a school is necessary or desirable for their healthy physical and mental development"; and "for attending to the health, nourishment and physical welfare of children attending nursery schools."

There would be no advantage at the present stage in going into all the details of the new system as proposed by the Bill. What has been given will suffice to indicate the general character of the system, and guide us as to the provisional attitude in which we should receive it. Obviously it will be far-reaching in its effects, and can hardly fail to involve us Catholics in expenses for which we are ill-prepared at the end of a costly war. For the general relation in which our solicitude for the Catholic education of our children will involve us is to remain as at present; that is to say, so far as we need for the securing of this object to have schools of our own, training colleges and kindred institutions of our own, we shall have to build them in cases where we do not at present possess them, or, where we do possess them, to enlarge them on a scale prescribed to us by the standards set to the locality by local authorities. The burden thus laid upon our financial resources will be heavier even than before, and, indeed, unless we can obtain certain concessions hitherto denied us, may prove to be altogether beyond us. But let us consider in the first place how far such a system as Mr. Fisher is advocating is necessary for the welfare of the country. There can be no doubt that it is, and that if we judge it dispassionately from the point of view of the country as a whole, and of our own rising generations as part of that whole, it must be regarded as an admirable scheme; capable, if carried out in the spirit in which it is projected, of removing serious blots from our present system and of elevating the educational and social tone of our people enormously.

Nursery schools already exist in some measure in the country, the initiative in this as in so many of our social reforms having been taken by voluntary enterprise. But, as always, the initiative thus taken has served to reveal the need of a great extension of this particular mode of ministrations which only a body like the State can carry on adequately. And we may point to the two volumes of reports by representatives of the Carnegie Trust, reviewed elsewhere in our present issue, as witnessing to the extent of the ravages on infant life through ignorance or neglect or incapacity on the part of parents to bring up their infants under conditions essential to the preservation of their health or even of their life. Happy-go-lucky notions of the advantage to the general welfare of the restriction of undue increments of population are discredited now not only in the name of religion, because of the immoral methods on which they chiefly relied, but in the name of social welfare also, by their inevitable tendency to stunt the growth of the nations.

And as to the advance of educational aims. There was a time when it was thought that a knowledge of the three R's was the modicum of education needful for those who from their circumstances would be chiefly occupied through life in manual occupations. That may have appeared to be the case to a generation which had only the conditions of the past to instruct them, conditions, that is to say, under which the great mass of the working population had not even the scanty qualifications to enable them to pass beyond their own narrow surrounding to an outlook on the larger life of educated humanity. But education is a living process which inevitably extends the frontiers of knowledge and awakens desires of a fuller knowledge still, for those who receive it and have latent capacities and talents for assimilating and developing whatever is sown in the soil of their minds: and it is a tangible fact, which escapes those only who do not reflect, that the education imparted and assimilated during the last half century or so has revealed far horizons to a much more numerous class, comprising members of what is misleadingly called the working class as well as of those who are called the gentry; and by so doing has created fresh social exigencies which cannot be suppressed, even if to suppress them were a thing advantageous in itself to the well-being of the community, instead of being the greatest misfortune that could befall it. For what lives must either be allowed to fulfil the full cycle of

its growth, or it is doomed to speedy extinction; indeed, when by life we mean not mere plant or animal life but human life, the onward path which it is impelled by its vital force to traverse, is not merely that of a cycle of individual existences of an onward course which completes itself and then recommences in a new generation, but one which progresses continuously and indefinitely, and is ever on the rise.

Continuation schools such as the new system seeks to provide on a large scale are certainly needed. Adverse critics of the existing system are accustomed to point to the great waste of effort which characterizes the system that has prevailed since 1870. Such an enormous expenditure of public money, and such scanty results to show for it when a year or two of working life have rubbed off the surface impressions which the previous years of elementary schooling had traced upon the minds of the children. It has always seemed to us that those who indulge in adverse criticism of this kind are unfair. Doubtless there are large numbers from among those who have received their education in our elementary schools who show very poor results for it. But this is also the case, *positis ponendis*, with those who have attended the secondary schools, or even public schools of high standing. Still there is also a goodly proportion of past pupils of the elementary as of the secondary schools who can show very good results indeed of the training given to them in the days of their childhood; a fair proportion of them, indeed, having been enabled by it to push upwards into respectable careers in life, or even into careers of high social and national importance. And if, on the other hand, there are so many failures to stand at the door of those educated under the present system, is it not chiefly due to the want of provision for the continuation of their education beyond the age of thirteen or less, when the elementary schools have had to part company with them because their parents under present conditions could not any longer afford to do without their scanty wages?

It remains to be seen how far it will be feasible to carry out Mr. Fisher's scheme for continuation schools on a sufficiently wide scale. The difficulties it will have to encounter will apparently be immense. In the industrial districts the half-timer difficulty will complicate the case, which will be pressed with all the might of the political influence alike of the workmen and the employers. It might seem that a general raising of the scale of wages would assuage the opposition of

the parents, but that is doubtful in itself, and the question of a wholesale rise in the rate of wages among a class who are already in this respect paid more highly than others of the same class throughout the country, is a question which experts in the science of economics are alone able to discuss competently. The idea of the Bill is apparently that in the districts in question a system of factory continuation schools would come into being which would alleviate the situation. There would be difficulties in that, at all events from the religious and moral point of view, but in non-factory districts it would appear that the difficulty of organizing a system of continuation schools must be still greater. The "young persons" are to get their continuation teaching during the day, at all events before 7 p.m., which in itself, if this teaching is to come to anything really practical, seems essential. But to what continuation schools are they to go, those near their homes, or near the places where they are, and if they change their employment, must this regularly involve changing their continuation schools?

These are the sort of difficulties which must arise in connection with the continuation schools, and until the schemes of the local authorities are drawn up it is not possible to form our minds on the subject. At most we can say that probably the Education Office has the different aspects of the subject in mind, and that the local authorities will have solutions adapted to their own neighbourhood. Meanwhile we must feel that the idea thus broached is in the right direction, and if it can be carried out is likely to have good results in consolidating and advancing the education of which the foundations are laid in the elementary schools. And there is one point here to be noted in which we Catholics, in common with others, must feel particular interest. We have thought seriously of our "leakage" during recent years, and have realized that it arises chiefly in our young people during the years immediately succeeding their release from school. The broad fact is that at that tender age they are not capable of governing themselves, and yet it is to that they are in fact reduced through the circumstance that their employment removes them so largely from the control of their parents and their teachers, and of their clergy. If Mr. Fisher's scheme is carried out it will tend to reduce this difficulty considerably. Indeed it is one which he seems to have had specially in mind—for it is one that affects "young persons" generally,

particularly boys: and in his speech the other day at Sheffield he referred to it specially.

The period [he said] between 14 and 18 is the most plastic and most docile period in human life. Boys and girls develop at different times. A boy who has done little up to 14 may suddenly develop powers at the age of 16, 17, or 18, and a large amount of intellectual waste is involved in a process under which education for the great mass of the people suddenly stops at 14, unless these young people find their way into evening schools [he says "evening schools," these being the only form of continuation schools at present available], and are under disinterested educational observation at this most vital period of their lives.

Mr. Fisher, it is true, lays stress here on the intellectual rather than on the ethical side of this need for boys and girls in their teens being under disinterested control, but that is merely because of the context of the passage in which his words came.

Whilst citing this reference by Mr. Fisher in his Sheffield speech to the benefits which he hopes through the continuation schools to secure for our "young persons" in the after-school years, we must cite also the words from the same speech in which he claims for his Bill the benefits it is calculated to confer on the physical health of our children.

For the first time [he says] the Bill provides for a national system of physical training for young people. The statement has been made that a million children are incapable of getting the advantage of education through physical defects, and half a million are the victims of dirt and disease. That is a blot on our civilization, and I believe that if the Bill passes into law it will prove to be one of the most powerful instruments ever invented for the furtherance of national health and physique.

In Clause 2, as we have seen, the local authorities are, in co-operation with other bodies, to make arrangements for the preparation of children for further education in schools other than elementary and their transference at suitable ages to such schools. This again is a provision which in itself is excellent. It is not of course contemplated that all the children in elementary schools shall in due time be passed on to secondary schools, but that those of them shall who offer sufficient promise of benefiting by the transfer, as a goodly number of them will offer. This also is in continuation of the present custom, though it will probably mean an exten-

sion of it; and one class it must necessarily include, for it is now required that those who aspire to become teachers shall have passed through a secondary school training. But here we come upon a point of defect in our present legislation which, so far as one can gather from the Bill, it is not proposed to remove. Bishop Ward, of Brentwood, refers to it in the following words communicated to the *Universe* for Sept. 7th:

Mr. Fisher says he does not want to raise the religious difficulty at all. He wants to leave the religious question where it was—neither better nor worse, and there is no reason to doubt that this is really his wish. He does not wish to raise the question at all. But he can hardly realise the full effect of the present regulations. As they stand they cannot possibly be accepted by Catholics, and we must necessarily do all we can to oppose them. During the war there is an informal truce, but as soon as ever peace returns it will be our duty to bring the matter strongly forward. As affairs stand at the present moment it is absolutely impossible to open a new Catholic Secondary School without being financially handicapped in competition with others, and being unable to receive public grants under the full scale. This fact is often lost sight of because existing Catholic Secondary Schools continue to thrive under the Regulations, as, for example, St. Francis Xavier's, Liverpool, St. Cuthbert's, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Stamford Hill School, and many others. But it is almost forgotten that when the Regulations were instituted they were so manifestly impossible for Catholic schools that the obnoxious clauses were waived in the case of existing schools. That is to say, the schools which were in existence at the time the Regulations were promulgated could be continued on a Catholic basis and earn grants like other schools. But for all schools established more than a limited period after the Regulations were brought in such waivers are not granted. Hence it is necessary for any new school to be administered by a governing body, the majority of whom, under Article 23b, may be non-Catholics. This is a position which we cannot accept, the more so as Article 23a of the Regulations provides that no religious disqualifications can be admitted in the appointment of a teacher, who may be, therefore, a Protestant or an unbeliever, or anything or nothing, and, being appointed by a body the majority of whom may be non-Catholics, we should not secure that which is to us absolutely essential, namely, Catholic teachers in our own Catholic schools. The whole question of Secondary Schools has become more important of late, as it is necessary now for all teachers in elementary schools to go through secondary schools. The result will be, if we have not sufficient Secondary Schools of our own

that we shall have to have teachers in our elementary schools who have been educated at a non-Catholic school and have never had a proper Catholic training. This prospect is a most serious one, and calls for all our energy and force to meet it.

We cannot, however, think that it is really intended to leave us in this plight. Among those responsible for the administration of the Education Acts in the country, there is a general appreciation of our Catholic educational methods and institutions. They acknowledge freely that they have something themselves to learn from them; and the decay of bigotry, which the experience of the war is hastening on, may surely be expected to lead to the removal of a restriction which is nothing more than a relic of the bigotry of the past.

This outline of the system which is now being considered throughout the country may serve to acquaint our readers with the points likely to have a bearing on our Catholic schools. Some of these cannot but cause us anxiety just now, but it would be a mistake to regard the new scheme as otherwise than welcome. It has in itself capabilities for doing a vast amount of good in the country, and as such must command our sympathies; nor is there any intention in its projectors to exclude us from the advantages it confers on the country generally. At most there may be some misconceptions in their minds as to what we desire and what we need for the maintenance of those ends to which so powerful and respected a body as the Catholic community is so intensely attached; and on these misconceptions by our firm but amicable representations to those whom we are yearly getting to know better, as they are getting to know us better, will tell in due course. We cannot fail to note, too, repeated phrases in the Bill inviting the local authorities to take counsel with bodies interested in the various measures, phrases which if not intended directly to refer to the representatives of the Catholic Church can easily be made to include them.

Meanwhile the lesson to which the publication of the text of the Bill points as most important to learn, is the need of acting through our own organized bodies, such as the Bishops, the Catholic Education Council, and the Catholic Federation. Modern Governments attach great importance to representations made to them by those who can establish a valid claim to speak in the name of important sections or classes of the population. And here it occurs to us to hazard the suggestion

that it might be well to incorporate the Foundation Managers of our Catholic Schools, elementary and secondary, either with our Education Council or our Catholic Federation, so that they might have an authorized channel through which their collective voices could be heard.

S. F. S.

THE RISK

NOT Sara, when she followed Abram forth
 In his strange search after the Unknown God;
 Rebecca, when she left the proved worth
 Of home and friends, and as a pilgrim trod;
 Or Debbora, though with prophetic song
 She sent her country's manhood to the fray;
 Not Jael, when she faced a deadly wrong,
 And nerved her woman's arm, alone, to slay;
 Not these, or any of that famous kin—
 Rahab and Ruth, fair Esther, Judith brave—
 Who staked and threw, if haply they might win
 Some worthy end, or life by losing save:
 Not one of these ran such a risk as she,
 The Spouse of God, the Mother of God, the Maid,
 Who dared the extremest of felicity,
 Well knowing that the price must sure be paid.

Ah, but to hold Him close against her breast,
 Ah, but to have Him playing round her knee,
 To lift and lay Him down for noonday rest. . . .
 When others lifted she was there to see.
 Ah, but to wash those baby hands and feet,
 To fill His little porringer with care,
 To feed Him sup by sup, the helpless sweet. . . .
 When others fed Him, helpless, she was there.
 She shared His manhood's hope, she shared His loss:
 She heard her deepest faith proclaimed a lie:
 Unflinching, left the Cradle for the Cross:
 She watched His childhood's sleep, she saw Him die.

*Most prudent Virgin, warn His other lovers:
 "Beware, our God is a consuming flame.
 Know, from the wound He wounds with none recovers,
 The Lion of Judah, Whom no man may tame."*

JUDITH CARRINGTON.

MANY WAYS. I

IN a series of articles dealing with some aspects and some examples of Catholic fiction, a rather full treatment has been accorded to what appear to me to be incomparably the best works of Mrs. Wilfrid Ward. In the course of the same series something has at least incidentally been said of more than one of the late Mgr. Benson's novels. Of these, Father Martindale's admirable biography has made it quite needless to write more fully. But I am unwilling to forgo the pleasure of fulfilling an intention expressed in these pages several months ago, of giving some account of the fictional work of a third writer, whose charming record of his experiences as a military chaplain during this present war would alone have been enough to endear him to every reader of *THE MONTH*. I refer, of course, to "John Ayscough," who must needs be spoken of under the pen-name of his own choice. And first, a few words on this writer's literary methods (which are indeed more than merely "literary" methods) by way of comparison, and in part of contrast, with those of Mrs. Wilfrid Ward.

Life, as viewed by us short-sighted and purblind mortals, is on the whole episodic rather than dramatic. In the sight of God, to whom a thousand years are as one day, every apparently trivial incident has, of course, its significant place in the mighty drama which embraces all the ages. But from the ordinary observer the significance of what we call trivial incidents is for the most part concealed; and it is only now and then, and here and there, that the action of Divine Providence in the shaping of linked lives to a determinate end becomes in some limited measure dimly visible. Hence the art of the dramatist or novelist is commonly shown in a kind of skilful foreshortening, by means of which influences which in actual life for the most part operate intermittently through a long series of years, are made to produce their results within a relatively short compass of time. On the other hand the novelist, though hardly the dramatist, may choose to deny himself the particular kind of interest which is aroused by a more or less obviously intricate but quickly-ripening plot, and may prefer a more episodic style or method, and thereby approach more nearly to life as it is actually lived.

It may not perhaps be deemed unduly fanciful if I assimilate or "analogize" the difference between these two styles or methods with that which obtains between the conventions of Eastern and Western art. The European cannot imagine why the Chinese painter, ignorant (as he supposes) of perspective, does not represent things as they are actually seen. The Chinese is no less puzzled to know why the European painter depicts things not as they are, but as they are seen from his particular point of view. A man is not really small just because he happens to be standing a hundred yards away. Why not walk up to him and paint him in his true proportions?¹ There is no need to labour the comparison. Enough to say that the experiment of adopting the episodic method is, from a literary point of view, a hazardous one, since it requires quite exceptional qualities in the writer to keep the reader's interest alive when such a method is pursued. If it be said that, roughly speaking, and with due allowance for exception on either side, John Ayscough's method is episodic and Mrs. Ward's dramatic, the predominant characteristics of the two writers will perhaps have been fairly indicated. As a rule and by preference John Ayscough leads the reader along at a leisurely pace, sketching by the way, as from the life, and with a shrewdness which dispels all tedium, scenes and persons and incidents and accidents, each of which has an interest quite independent of that of the main story, and yet for the most part more closely related to the development of the main story than is at first sight apparent.

Take, for instance, the exquisite thumb-nail portrait of 'Maso (*i.e.*, Tommaso) in *Marotz*, which needs must here be reduced to even smaller proportions than those which it has in the story. 'Maso is a crippled and cross-grained old cobbler, the torment of his wife and the dread of his neighbours by reason of the weight of his fist and the sharpness of his tongue, who daily plies his trade in front of his cottage in the steep street of an up-country Sicilian village. No persuasion can avail to induce him to go to confession. He has forgotten his sins. "Perhaps Gesù Cristo has forgotten them also. Of what use to remind Him?" When, after his death, excuse was made for him on the score of ignorance, his wife with a fine sense of loyalty fired up and said: "'Maso was not ignorant. Only he knew things in his way. His way was

¹ Cf. "Pictures in Chinese," in *THE MONTH*, Dec, 1912.

different." And the author's description of his death may be taken to imply something more than a merely sentimental sympathy with the wife's large-hearted allowance. Maso was in his accustomed place, and engaged as usual, when a procession appeared at the end of the street. The parish priest was taking the Blessed Sacrament to the bedside of a sick parishioner. Suddenly, seized with an apoplectic stroke, the old cobbler fell back, apparently dead. But as the procession drew near he revived for a moment, to say only: "HE will understand."¹ And those words: "He will understand," might almost be taken as a motto characteristic of the whole of John Ayscough's literary output. In season and out of season, if such a reminder could ever be out of season, the author insists, by implication for the most part rather than by direct statement, that God's ways are not our ways, and that His uncovenanted mercies are beyond the reach of our puny reckonings. "We," says "Poor Sister" (the Superior of a convent in Vienna) in the same story, "We who know scarcely anything of ourselves, are so ready to decide about other people, whose very faces we have only seen in certain lights."² The same lesson of large-hearted allowance is taught again in the same work in the bishop's kindly criticism of Piccolo's singularly eloquent and in parts most beautiful lay-sermon:

It was hard—full of sting and reproach. As if he was *biting* at the hearts of those poor ignorant sheep of mine. And it was not humble: all the reproach was in the second person. He seemed to have no share in their faults. . . . He showed no pity for their temptations, having known none himself.³

Before laying aside this fascinating volume, whose flaws, if flaws they be, it is no part of my present purpose to indicate, I must needs quote from the passage descriptive of the death of the Duca di San Vito, one of those secondary and second-rate characters whose good points John Ayscough is so often at pains to emphasize. The old duke is absent from home when he is stricken down by his last illness. But he will return to die.

"One should be born at home and one should die at home. . . . One must die, . . . and there are certain things to do. Before I die the priest will have to come, and the doctor and——"

¹ Ayscough, *Maritz*, pp. 157, 182.

² P. 151.

³ P. 342.

"And Some One else," whispered Marotz.

He nodded. "Yes, and He must be received properly. All the family should be there. Once, long ago, when I was a *ragazzino*, the King—our King of the Two Sicilies—came, and I remember all the family received him . . . ; and He also is a King, and coming to my house, to visit me, He must be received accordingly. . . ."

As Duca di San Vito he had been of considerable, though local, importance, and the manner of his life had fostered his sense of it. He was too intelligent to fancy he would have been equally important out in the big world, and not to be fully and disagreeably aware that, in that greater world beyond this, he would be of no importance at all. He liked his own individuality, and felt that it must be swamped in the vast [social] equality of heaven. . . . Nevertheless he had to die, and what was inevitable he submitted to, without complaint or fuss. His life had been manly, and in a fashion dignified; and his death would be manly and dignified too.¹

Large-heartedness is, however, only one of the characteristics that distinguish the work of John Ayscough. His observant insight into the ways of Providence leads him to emphasize the truth that God's mercy acts at long range, and that the human instruments whom He employs for the execution of His designs may be fetched from the ends of the earth and from the most diverse quarters. Hence, indeed, the title which has been chosen for this article.

In *Mezzogiorno*, of which the leading theme may be described as God's plot for the emancipation, illumination and even perhaps the sanctification of Gillian Thesiger, the human agents in the development of the plot are not only Englishmen and Englishwomen of various more or less normal types—including, besides her crotchety father, a peeress, a parson, a priest and a peasant—but also a Russian (Gillian's mother; from whom she inherited her indolent temperament), two Greek scoundrels, an Arab servant, a Sicilian Duke, and lastly her third husband, an English squire of Spanish descent. The story, which it is not very easy to compress into a short compass, is, in outline, as follows:

Gillian Thesiger is the daughter of a self-exiled and cynically soured itinerant artist, a man of good birth—not far, indeed, from the succession to an English peerage, but of very limited means—and of a Russian mother whom she barely remembers. Her father's only child and constant companion,

¹ Pp. 297—301.

she has been allowed to grow up into young womanhood entirely without religion; nor does she even share her father's æsthetic interest in Catholic ceremonial. Unswervingly faithful in her attendance on a good natured but thoroughly selfish parent, she nurtures a profound though unexpressed distaste for the pursuits which have condemned them both to a wandering life. By nature, as has been said, of an indolent disposition, she is fully alive to the limitations of her opportunities, a thralldom from which she would fain escape; but—following the line of least resistance—she is philosophically determined to make the best of the circumstances in which she finds herself. In the course of their travels, father and daughter pay a visit to Tripoli, where they are somewhat officiously befriended by the Greek Consul, one Eustachio Zante, who erroneously imagines Gillian to be an heiress, and who has designs on her supposed fortune. At Tripoli, Thesiger quite unexpectedly and almost suddenly dies, after having been received into the Catholic Church during the few brief hours of his fatal illness. Gillian is thus left entirely unprotected, and deprived of all but the slenderest means of support. Eustachio, still imagining her to be rich, seizes the occasion to press his suit, Gillian, dazed and lonely, accepts him, and on the very day after her father's funeral they go through a ceremony of marriage at the Greek consulate. Eustachio, however, is careful, for his own selfish ends, so to arrange matters, unknown to her, that the marriage shall not be legally valid. In the course of a few months he abandons her under the pretext of a journey on business, and writes her a heartless letter in which he declares that they are both free from all matrimonial ties and obligations. How he shortly afterwards died, how Gillian, after leaving Tripoli for Sicily made the acquaintance of the Duke of Torre Greca, who fell in love with her, married her, and left her a widow with a title and an adequate fortune,—this part of Gillian's history is very briefly disposed of in John Ayscough's pages. After these somewhat elaborate preliminaries the real business of the story may be said to begin when Gillian purchases "Moat," a country residence in Rentshire, where she and her wealthy neighbour, Philip Andros of Andros, fall in love with one another, neither being aware of the other's passion. Here, too, she makes the acquaintance and to some extent comes under the influence of Father Pope, Philip's chaplain, who—being as uncompromisingly outspoken as his patron is meticu-

lously reticent about religious matters—tells her some home truths which not a little disturb her somewhat artificial equanimity. But, as will presently be more fully told in the author's own words, she is more strongly and far more strangely affected by her intercourse with a certain Mark Herrick, a labourer on her future husband's estate. Mark is believed and believes himself to be dying, but is so cheered by Gillian's visits that he makes a quite wonderful recovery, and lives long enough to provide the tragic element of the story. Gillian's reception into the Catholic Church, her marriage to Philip after an accident in the hunting-field has served to reveal to each the love of the other, and the uneventful record of the early years of their married life, would seem to promise anything rather than a sudden and—for the moment—rather overwhelming catastrophe. But the interest at once becomes thrilling with the appearance on the scene of Empedocle Zante, younger brother of Eustachio, whom he impersonates, declaring to Gillian that the report of his death had been false, and that she is still bound to him as his wife. A little adroit cross-questioning is sufficient to convict him of the hollowness of his pretensions; but meanwhile Andros has become aware of a chapter in Gillian's past of which she had often felt she ought to speak, but which—dreading complications—she had concealed from him. Her punishment, in the form of acute mental anguish under stress of the fear lest she should have lost the love of her husband, is, as the author explicitly reminds us, to be regarded not as "an example of inexorable fate" but as "an intimation of Divine mercy. Otherwise the wound she inflicted on her own character would have gone unhealed into a greater world than this." Of the punishment of Empedocle himself—his murder by Mark Herrick, who has divined that he is persecuting Gillian—it can only be said, as in so many other instances of the sudden and violent death of apparently unrepentant sinners, that it probably at least saved him from adding crime to crime in the prosecution of a career of determined villainy. That the murder, and the murderer's conviction on the capital charge, together with the relapse into a mortal illness which brought his release from the hangman's halter, became the occasion of Herrick's conversion to the Catholic faith, and of Gillian's ascent to spiritual heights which had else been untrod by her, is the *dénouement* of the long-drawn plot.

It would be tedious as well as unprofitable to call atten-

VOL. CXXX.

U

tion to more than two or three points in the development of this plot which might easily escape the notice of the careless reader, but which are, I think, not without significance. The death of Thesiger, as a Catholic, far from immediately and directly predisposing his daughter to inquire into the truth of the religion in which this discontented wanderer had at last found barely an hour's peace in this life, seemed rather to cause her to include the Catholic Church in the list of things which—as connected with his unloved memory—she detested. And yet the remembrance of that tardy death-bed conversion must needs have found a place in her thoughts when, years afterwards, she found herself so powerless to minister to the soul's needs of Mark Herrick, when he in his turn believed death to be fast approaching. Again, the self-less fidelity of Bringali, the Arab servant who befriended Gillian in the days of her sorrow and utter loneliness at Tripoli, not only provides a picture as perfect in itself as that of 'Maso, but also serves as a fitting and preparing prelude to that worshipful admiration with which Gillian, later on, found herself regarded by Herrick. And lastly, Lady Oscathorpe and her entourage, with their social meanderings and contrivings, and that little crowd of "supers"—Mr. Thorne and Mr. Tarf, Mr. Chase and Mr. Rudge, Mr. Wortley and all the rest of them—who may be thought, perhaps, unduly to delay the action of the piece and to encumber the stage, are, if I mistake not, intended to remind us of the truth that in our actual experience we come in contact with innumerable persons whose sayings and doings are, relatively to ourselves, as devoid of significance as the furniture of the houses we may happen to visit; and also of that other more important truth, that the busybodies of the world, however exalted their rank and station, are but a poor substitute for God's Providence, which, however, often makes use of them to further designs which are far removed from their thoughts and intentions.

But the keynote of the whole book is struck in the passage which describes how Gillian, returning from a visit to Mark Herrick, is troubled in mind by the thought of his undisguised sentiments towards herself.

Worship, she learned from Mark, was a real thing, and any real thing existing must have a real object. This must be something worthy of Mark's worship, though she herself were never so unworthy. She had divined much more than the young man had merely said or looked; his words had been fierce but almost

stammering, an effort of expression desperate rather than successful; and his looks, half savagely intense as they were, had been also half ashamed, as though he durst not look the whole of what he felt. Nevertheless he had made an "atmosphere" in which his hearer had never breathed before, an atmosphere "rare" in both senses. Her consciousness of personal unworthiness had not been mock-modest but impersonal and sincere; and she supposed that not only was she herself undeserving of such worship, but that no woman could be worthy of it—no human being. But the worship was real, and there must be a real object of it somewhere beyond humanity, since in humanity no adequate objective could be imagined.

It was, it may appear, an odd fashion of arriving at the idea of God, but *there are many ways, as various as men and the needs of men. The perfect may rise to the Divine love perfectly, the imperfect by a crooked ladder, oddly-fashioned of an incongruous tree.*

Nor was Gillian the only character in the story who was led to God by strange paths. Stranger still, and far more painful, was that by which poor Herrick was led. Here is Gillian's "inarticulate" prayer for him, in his day of deepest gloom:

"Pity! By this wild way lead him higher than he meant. The martyrs could die for You—not much that. He meant to die for one of us. You know better than I. I cannot teach You the path of Mercy, in which all Your life was travelled."¹

"He will understand." "You know better than I." "He knows. Ask Him" (Consuelo's words to Rupert Stratford, to be quoted again in a concluding article). In these phrases we have the key, or rather the consolation of knowing that Another has the key, to many mysteries. And we may well be thankful to John Ayscough for so pointedly reminding us of so comforting a truth.

Yet it would be a great mistake to suppose that John Ayscough has no other moods than those of generous allowance for human weakness, of sympathy with the second-rate, of acutely observant and pleased recognition of the far-reaching designs of Providence. As befits a true disciple of the Divine Master, he has and can express a fine scorn of hypocrisy and of intolerant bigotry of the worldly type,—in other words of pharisaism. Outside of the pages of Cobbett, or of the columns of *The Tablet* in the days of its founder

¹ P. 321.

and first editor, I know of no more scathing indictment (satire perhaps it should be called) of pharisaic Protestantism than is to be read in the pages of *Monksbridge*. The author will, I am sure, pardon my condensation of his description of a scene, or rather of two scenes combined, that deserve to live in the memory of every educated English-speaking Catholic.

Perkin (I forget his surname), the hero of the story, is a scholar of "Abbot's School," Monksbridge, and has been advised to specialize in history. He resolves to become a Catholic and to renounce his scholarship, and has just told his mother of his intention. Sylvia and Marjory are his sisters, and Hampden Monk—now Lord Monksbridge—is Sylvia's fiancé. The son of a manufacturer, his lordship has adopted the Anglican persuasion, as more suitable than Nonconformity to a personage of his wealth and position. Sylvia now hears from her mother that Perkin has become—though in fact he only hopes to become—"a Roman Catholic."

"No! a Roman Catholic? It is absurd to be a Roman Catholic nowadays." "The Cardinal was one when he founded Abbot's," Marjory suggested. "Of course," said Sylvia coldly. "Our ancestors all were. It was the custom. But to be a Catholic now is ridiculous. And no one is."

Presently Lord Monksbridge is announced, and announces in his turn that the Bishop of Lowminster is coming to Monksbridge, that there is to be an address of welcome, and that Perkin will read it.

"It certainly will not be read by me," Perkin answered, and it was evident that something was going to happen.

"Why shouldn't it be you?" Lord Monksbridge asked with some sharpness, "I believe the Warden intends it."

"Because," he said, "I am going to do something which will make it impossible. I shall not belong to Abbot's next week. I am going to become a Catholic."

"What mad whim is this?" asked Hampden with a sour scorn.

"It is not new. It has been coming on during many months."

"And you kept it a secret until now?"

"No. As soon as I thought my misgivings might end as they *have* ended, I told my mother. No one else had any right to know."

"She should have consulted *me*. I regard myself as her eldest son. I consider that *you* should have consulted me."

"What I did not tell my sisters I never even dreamt of telling you. It did not concern you at all."

"But it did. It does. It concerns all who are connected with your family. Your selfish folly, should you persist in it, may affect most lamentably your mother and one of your sisters [the other being prospectively well provided for, as the future Lady Monksbridge]. And how will you excuse yourself to the Warden? What explanation of your misconduct will you have to offer? You will do more than displease him, you will disgrace him. To the Warden of Abbot's School it will be a deep disgrace that one of his pupils should prove renegade to the religion of that School."

For the first time Perkin smiled. "The School," he said simply, "existed many centuries before Dr. Fitz-Simon became its Warden. It was founded for Catholics, and we are bragging of our Founder eternally; he was first an Abbot and then a Cardinal, and always a Catholic; it can hardly disgrace him or his school that one of his boys should turn to his own faith. They told me history was where I could probably do best; and I studied it, and first of all the history of our School itself and of its Founder, of what he founded it for, of what he willed to have taught in it, which was first and foremost the Catholic faith; and the more I studied what that faith was, the more I loved it and our great Founder, the more true I found his belief, the more outrageous and false and mean and baseless the charges made against it. By becoming a Catholic I know that I must leave my School, because there is no place in it for anyone who has come to believe what its Founder believed, and founded to have taught there. I know this must be so, but I am not willing to let you say that I disgrace the Cardinal's red gown [the uniform of the School] by joining the Cardinal's Church."¹

The scene ends, characteristically enough, in a tiff between my lord and his intended, whose sensitive pride—or what she imagined to be such—he had wounded by a reference to the family poverty. We all remember the man who asked James I. to make him a gentleman. This was beyond the King's power, so he made him a lord instead. Monksbridge was a lord of this class. "Do you," he had rudely asked Perkin, "intend to hang upon your good mother's small means? You may be certain that I shall do nothing for you." This rouses Sylvia, who soundly rates him for presuming to imagine that any member of *her* family wished to be dependent on his wealth, or was dazzled by his title.

Perhaps the reader will conclude that Sylvia never would be Lady Monksbridge; nor would she have been, I think, if the

¹ Ayscough, *Monksbridge*, pp. 111 and 250—254.

second Lord Monksbridge had been worth his father's little finger. But then, he wasn't, and the next Lord and Lady Monksbridge were Hampden and Sylvia, a most respectable couple. *The world can, I think, be bought, if you pay its price, which is your own self.*¹

Again,—to make some final reflections on the previous story,—though John Ayscough's personal sympathies would doubtless be with the more reticent sort of people rather than with those who are more outspoken, with Philip Andros, for instance, rather than with Father Pope, yet he is large-hearted enough to recognize that Father Pope has his place in the all-embracing schemes of Providence, which creates no tool perfect, and makes up for the deficiencies of one by the superfluous energy of another, and mitigates the undesirable consequences which might ensue from a superabundance of energy in one quarter, by the soothing influences of a prevalent mediocrity.

It has been said that Father Pope tells Gillian some home truths; and it may perhaps be admitted that a course of undiluted strong waters, of which the following passage (again somewhat condensed) may be taken as a sample, might have been too much for Gillian's somewhat delicate spiritual constitution. But then, Gillian was not compelled to listen to Father Pope every day or all day long, and as an occasional tonic his words proved most healthful. The conversation had somehow turned on intemperance.

"Drunkenness is beastly," said Father Pope, "but it's a beastliness that the Reformation made general and national. Before that, it was an individual and personal shame; it was not the national vice of England, of Denmark, or of Scotland, till those countries threw off the yoke of the Church, and it isn't the national vice of Ireland now, though Ireland's too near not to have learned too much of it. . . . Peoples that have dipped, or are dipping into the misery of unfaith try to cheer their gloom by the beastly remedy of drink. The death of faith brings such a blackness into men's hearts that the poor wretches clutch at whatever will make them cheerful for a moment. Not the publican but Calvin and Luther and Knox drive to gin. If your drunken drayman kicks his wife to death, it's as much Henry VIII's fault as his. If God has no rights, who else has any? The State? Why, the State is me and my mates. Humanity? Why, humanity means me and other people, and I take leave to think of myself first. Bill Sykes has a taste for bashing heads with a

¹ P. 361. Italics mine.

shovel, Stiggins has a taste for black clothes and total abstinence. [So! We had thought that Stiggins had his "particular wanity."] Let Stiggins stick to his clothes and his tea, but *my* tastes are mine, and I'll follow them. Morality without God is too much to expect. If there is a binding law, there must be a lawgiver, with the right and power to bind. If there be no lawgiver there can be no law. Oh, but the State has the right to protect itself and its citizens by law. Yes, but if the citizens say they *are* the State, and don't care about the law, or only care about dodging it? *What keeps society going is the remnant of inherited belief, habitual deference to a law that rested on a Divine sanction; when the belief is altogether obsolete, the respect for law will be finally worn out.* Then Anarchy, the logical inexorable child of the Reformation, outlaws the lawgiver, and flies abroad."¹

It is possible that the author, or the persons into whose mouths he puts these words, may be somewhat excessively prejudiced against democracy. But even if the highest estimate of democracy, as an ideal, be adopted, the dictum will still hold true that *Corruptio optimi pessima*, and a godless democracy, heir to the churchless Reformation, is a portent to be dreaded and prayed against. Moreover, if Father Pope's convictions are rather too uncompromisingly worded to suit the weak digestion of a Gillian, they are not a whit too strong to be assimilated by the digestion of a spiritually healthy man or (if one may borrow and in borrowing modify a phrase of St. Catharine's) a manly woman. And the lesson conveyed by them is urgently needed when moral lawlessness threatens us with a worse evil than even the curse of intemperance.

HERBERT LUCAS.

¹ Pp. 253—255.

THE CHRYSANTHEMUM

HE stood at the edge of the pavement, waiting till somebody should offer to pilot her across the road. It was the method she was in the habit of using in her own familiar district, but now she was a quarter of a mile away, at the crowded tram terminus. But she waited patiently, tapping the pavement with the worn ferule of her stick.

Presently a man, lounging at the open door of the fire-station, strolled across the wide pavement towards her. "Do you want to cross the road?" he asked, his voice coming as a surprise, for she had not distinguished his step on the crowded pavement. She explained, her voice trembling with excitement, that she was on her way to the class for blind women at D—.

"That's too fur for you to go all alone, ain't it?" he asked, taking her elbow in a strong grip. He pushed her through the waiting queue without ceremony, and landed her at the door of the car, where a dozen kindly hands reached out to help her.

As the tram swung into speed, a man with his arm in a sling sat down on the steps of the drinking-fountain hard by, and, pulling a *Daily Mirror* from his pocket, began to read with philosophic calm. He was a big man, in blue clothes with a scarlet tie, and "Australia" on the shoulder of his khaki overcoat. The fireman stopped and looked at him curiously.

"You've made a mistake," he said, "this ain't the blooming Antipodes. We've got winter now—not the time for picnics. You made way for that old woman, didn't you?" he asked, jerking his thumb in the direction of the tram-lines.

The Australian looked up with a scowl as if he had been accused of several misdeeds at once—then meeting his interlocutor's good-humoured eyes, grinned. "I've stood aside for three cars," he said, "but I'll take the next, whoever doesn't—but I guess when it's my turn for St. Dunstan's I'll not be sorry I stood back."

The fireman nodded. "So long, matey," he said. "I'll get reported if I'm caught off duty."

The Australian turned to watch him across the road, till he had again taken his old stand just inside the big, ever-open door. Here he stood like a beneficent spider, watching the throng of trams, motors, horses and pedestrians that surged between the Town Hall and the church opposite that looked as if it had been built from a child's box of bricks. Behind him a subordinate whistled "Tipperary" while he polished the already twinkling brass against a Rembrandtesque background of darkness flecked by scarlet paint.

Meanwhile Mrs. Llewellyn sat bolt upright in the corner of the car where some compassionate people had placed her. In the palm of her left-hand cotton glove she tightly clutched the penny for fare, the rest of her floating capital was hidden in a mysterious pocket where it was difficult for even herself to find it. The tram was full, as it nearly always is at this time of day, for it is the road to the place known as "Guy's" or the "Orspital." For some time, however, the blind woman could distinguish little in the clack of conversation half-drowned, even in her observant ears, by the unaccustomed clang and clatter of a tram-car moving fast in crowded streets. Presently a woman's voice sounded good-naturedly. It had, as a matter of fact, been talking some time, but Mrs. Llewellyn had not realized that it was addressed to her.

"Well, Lizzie and me were sittin' there on two chairs, waiting for our turn when up comes a young gentleman. 'E was wot they call a stoddent, 'ad on a white coat, and very badly ironed it was; I couldn't have done it worse myself when I was doin' second-class work at the laundry. Well, up 'e comes to my Liz and says, 'Ave I put any drops in yer eyes?' 'You 'ave not,' I says, answering for her, for my Liz never 'as a word to say for 'erself. 'You 'ave not,' I says, 'but the nurse over there, she did.' Then 'e went on to the young girl sittin' next me, and asks her the same thing. 'Yus,' she says, as quick as anything, and at that 'e looked quite put out and walks off to the nurse, and they talked and shook their 'eads and seemed reg'lar puzzled. And I was a bit surprised, myself. 'Whatever do you say that for, yer silly,' I says, 'they don't do it for their own pleasure, it's to do you good,' I says. 'Oh,' she says, silly like, 'them drops 'urt, and I don't like bein' 'urt.' 'Well,' I says, for I was a bit cross with 'er, 'if you live to be as old as me, you'll get 'urt a lot more than you 'ave been at present. And do you

suppose,' I says, 'that them pore fellows in the trenches like bein' 'urt any more than what you do. Thank the Lord you've been born a woman, and make the best of it.' And just then my Lizzie 'ad to go up to the doctor so I don't know what 'appened next. I was goin' to get out 'ere, but I'll go on to the next stop, it ain't more than the 'arf-penny, and it's a bit dull for you travellin' alone. It'll cheer you up a bit to 'ave somebody to talk to. I've got a daughter workin' at munitions. She's not a quiet one, like Lizzie, but, my word, some of 'em do go on. There was two of 'em 'ad been 'ousemaids in the same gentleman's 'ouse, and they got to quarrelling as to whether the cook ought to 'ave left 'er job when they did. They was standin' with a box of stuff between 'em, that they 'ad to use for their work, and one of 'em jerked it somehow, and it blew up. It's a wonder the 'ole hut wasn't smashed. They was both knocked over, and one of 'em 'ad her face 'urt and 'er arm blown clean off. 'Er face's spoilt for life and she was a pretty girl and she won't get no compensation because it was 'er own fault. I get out 'ere. I 'ope you'll get along all right, they're dangerous crossings."

The voluble, good-natured woman left the tram and Mrs. Llewellyn sat still in her corner, waiting till the conductress, according to promise, told her that the end of her journey had come. The way had been considerably lightened by the unexpected conversation, if such it could be called, her own share limited to an occasional nod or "You don't say so," rounded off by a final "Good-bye and thank ye kindly." But it was with alacrity that she rose at last when she felt a touch on her sleeve and heard "Here's yours—Napier Street. Wait a minute and I'll see you to the curb."

At last the worst part of the journey was done—it did not occur to her that she should have to return along the same way of jolting trams, lurching through a crowded space, packed with vague sounds and smells and touches against warm clothes. She stood steadily for a moment on the edge of the curb, where the tram woman's firm grasp had left her, conscious, though hardly listening to the sounds, that the tram, her last anchorage in the familiar, was moving rapidly from her ken. The little breeze blew against her cheek—it seemed to come from a distance, probably from a turning by which she must go.

A moment later footsteps sounded on the damp asphalt,

an old pair of feet and one much younger, and a child's voice rose in an excited shrillness: "Oh, Grannie, 'ere's another blind lady and she 'asn't got a leader. I'll take 'er along too."

So with a child's *camaraderie* which needs little explanation, Mrs. Llewellyn was safely towed to the door of the "class" of which she had dreamed, and with the slightest of introductions ensconced among a score or so of other blind women in front of a radiating, roaring fire. The room reeked with warming shabby humanity. There was a grateful smell of tea somewhere in the distance. There was a cheerful, kindly bustle, such as the sighted always make when receiving or speeding guests; and, above all, Mrs. Llewellyn felt, she was sure she did, the presence of Christmas chrysanthemums. She was not long left to silence. A lady came and sat on the bench near her.

"You have come a long way," she said, simply, "and I do not know your name."

There was the wiliness of the serpent in this remark, for a direct question Mrs. Llewellyn would probably have parried, not knowing her interlocutor; as it was she answered briefly and to the point, pronouncing her name with careful distinctness; in Sydenham, as in Middlemarsh, it is a matter for gratulation to possess a name that can be mispronounced.

"All the way from Sydenham and by yourself!" cried the lady. "How did you manage it?"

Here indeed was triumph. The long, dark journey was behind, Mrs. Llewellyn began to reap the reward of her enterprise. The worker who arranged the music and games came and looked at her, so did the worker who poured out the tea and cut the cake; and the secretary, after cogitating for a few minutes in a corner, with a pencil and cash book, went one better, for she announced, as the result of a hurried colloquy with the other officials, that the funds of the Society could manage the strain of paying the new member's fare from Sydenham, so that she, in her turn, might pay that necessary luxury, a guide. This was, of course, on condition that Mrs. Llewellyn would abide by the regulations, now about to be read over to her.

The rest of the afternoon passed according to this beginning. Each old lady seemed to have a lively anecdote to retail for the general amusement; stories other than gay were murmured into the sympathetic ear of one of the workers apart

from the rest. At the end of the afternoon, tea and buns came from mysterious back premises and, delight above all, Mrs. Llewellyn had not been mistaken, each, as she departed, received a large, soft, fragrant chrysanthemum to take home and remind her of bygone gardens in the country long ago. To Mrs. Llewellyn was accorded the further privilege of the company of a worker until she was once more safely ensconced in a corner of the car. And, extraordinarily, the very same free and easy, good-hearted conductress helped her in. "And you did get there?" she inquired, taking a moment's respite after a breathless clipping of tickets. Mrs. Llewellyn felt sure that, but for the presence of the lady at the tram stop, her story would have met with scant belief. As it was she was an object of mild curiosity to the other passengers. Serenely conscious of this fact, she sat upright, with her eyes half closed, one hand grasping firmly the crutch top of her trusty umbrella. She had great faith in that umbrella, as also in her Sunday hat and coat, presented to her as loot from a bundle for a rummage sale by a kind-hearted parlourmaid on Sydenham Hill. And across the breast of the shabby coat gleamed bravely the copper-coloured chrysanthemum. At least the lady had said it was copper-coloured and had said it was named "Lloyd George." But Mrs. Llewellyn's sightless eyes knew better. To her it was the colour of gold, like those that crowded the cottage garden, when she had first seen it, a bride in far off Wales. She could visualize very few things with clearness, but she could recollect the crisp beauty of those homely bridal flowers.

J. PARSON.

A SHAKESPEARE DISCOVERY :

HIS SCHOOL-MASTER AFTERWARDS A JESUIT

SHAKESPEARE'S personality is almost proverbially difficult to realize. Though we know many details about him, though many contemporaries refer to his literary eminence, yet we know so little about his intimate life. No letters, no journals, no confidential asides in all his writings, no human touches; everything is a little distant and formal. We have many law papers, accounts, and business matters, but all needs some interpretation before we can approach the personality of the great writer. It is the same story with the Master's master, as with the Master himself.

Until lately we really knew nothing about Father Simon Hunt, S.J. Even the voluminous Brother Foley could only gather two dates as the whole of his life as a Jesuit. As a school-master he was also unknown, lost under an erroneous identification. But modern research has gradually gathered a great deal of material regarding everyone connected with Stratford-upon-Avon during Shakespeare's life. Mrs. Stopes, Mr. Leach, Sir Sidney Lee and other diligent inquirers were aware of a Mr. Hunt as a teacher of Shakespeare, but went wrong in their identifications of the person. Finally, after various advances, which will appear more clearly as we proceed, Mr. J. B. Wainewright, with whom our readers are already acquainted, pointed out in *Notes and Queries* (1916. i. 414) the identification of Shakespeare's master with the Jesuit Father.

One of the chief monuments at Stratford-upon-Avon connected with Shakespeare's youth is the still existing Free Grammar School, to which, there is no reason to doubt, the boy would have gone from his seventh till his thirteenth, if not till his sixteenth year. This school still stands, though shorn by repairs of some of its charms, and it has also suffered the loss of all early records dating back to the sixteenth century. Still there is some documentary evidence about it, contemporary with Shakespeare. The master's wages, "xx poundes by the year," were paid by the Town Council, and the accounts of the Town Chamberlains remain. Moreover, selected passages from them were printed by Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps as far back as 1864.¹ From these accounts some

¹ J. O. Halliwell [Phillipps], *Stratford-upon-Avon in the times of the Shakespeares*, illustrated by extracts from the Council Books, London, 1864. The editing, un-

sort of list of masters can be, and indeed has long since been, deduced, and we cannot do better at this stage than to copy the printed entries in full, premising 1) that the accounts run from Michaelmas to Michaelmas, and 2) that the audit is made in January or February following. Thus the first line which follows, taken from p. 34 of Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps' *Stratford from the Council Books*, shows that the time covered was from the feast of St. Michael (29th September) 1568, to the corresponding feast of 1569. This account was rendered on the 27th of January, 1570. *Mutatis mutandis* the same explanation holds of all the entries.

I.

CHAMBERLAINS' ACCOUNTS OF SCHOOLMASTERS' WAGES
DURING SHAKESPEARE'S SCHOOL YEARS.

Phil- lipps.	Michael- mas	Michael- mas		li. s. d.
p. 34	1568 to	1569	Item to Mr. Acton the scholemaster for his wage	xx . .
p. "			Item, paid to Henri Russell for going with the scholemaster to Kyllingworth	. . ij viij
p. 36	1569 to	1570	Item paid to Mr. Acton at Christmas at our first entering,	ij vj viij
p. 40	1570 to	1571	It. payed to Mr. Roche the scholemaster	xx . .
p. 40	1571 to	1572	[No entry in Halliwell-Phillipps about the school]	
p. 45	1572 to	1573	Item, received of Mr. Hunt towards the repaying of the schole wyndowes	vjs xjd.
p. "			Payed to Mr. Hunt	xx . .
p. 48	1573 to	1574	Item paid to Mr. Hunt	xx . .
p. 50	1574 to	1575	Payed to the serjeants for a scholemaster from Warwick	. . ij .
	1575 to	1576	[No entry in Halliwell-Phillipps about the school]	. . .
	1576 to	1577	[No entry in Halliwell-Phillipps about the school]	. . .
p. 59	1577 to	1578	Item paid to Mr. Jenkis [Jenkins] scholemaster for his half yeres wage	x . .
p. 63	1578 to	1579	Item Mr. Jenkins, scole master	xv . .
			Paid to Mr. Jenkins the xi day of Julie, for Mr. Cottam	. . vi . .

fortunately, leaves much to be desired. We are not told on what principle entries are selected or omitted, and, as will be seen, there are some inexplicable gaps in the series of school payments.

From this it appears that Shakespeare will have had many masters; possibly five or six. Baptized 26th April, 1564, he would have reached school age in 1571. Thus he probably did not know Mr. Acton; but he may have begun school under Mr. Roche up to Michaelmas 1571. He would have had Mr. Hunt, probably (as will appear more clearly below) from Michaelmas 1571 till at least Michaelmas 1574, and probably also (as we shall see) till midsummer 1575. Then came an unknown master from Warwick: then Mr. Jenkins in 1578. Finally, if as is not unlikely little William remained longer at school, he would in 1579 have come under Mr. Cottam "of London."

In this list Mr. Hunt is mentioned without his Christian name, and Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps, with amateurish readiness, identified him with one who afterwards became a local clergyman, Thomas Hunt, the curate of Luddington in 1584, when he was suspended for contumacy.¹ This identification was at first generally accepted, by Sir Sidney Lee in the early editions of his *Life of Shakespeare* (which began in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, 1897) and his *Stratford-upon-Avon till the Death of Shakespeare*, and also by Mrs. Stopes, in her very interesting *Shakespeare's Warwickshire Contemporaries*, 1907.

About the same date Mr. A. F. Leach, who has written so much in the *Victoria County Histories* on School History, treated the subject anew in *Warwickshire*, vol. ii., p. 337. He was for identifying the schoolmaster with George Hunt, a Merchant-Taylor schoolboy, who took his degree from Magdalen College, Oxford, in 1573, and might have put in a term of teaching at Stratford before he returned as Fellow of his College in 1575. Mr. Leach has also written excellently on the same subject in the *Journal of Education* in March 1908. These papers inspired Mr. Bayley to treat the question again in *Notes and Queries* for 1916, and this in turn led Mr. Wainwright to point out the identification of the Stratford master with the Jesuit.

2.

SIMON HUNT'S TEACHING LICENCE.

The important document which Mr. Bayley and Mr. Wainwright used, and which gives us Hunt's Christian name, and the date of his coming to Stratford, is the licence to teach

¹ Halliwell-Phillipps, *Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare*. 1887, Vol. II. p. 364, note 299.

issued by Bishop Bullingham, and preserved at folio 5 of his episcopal register at Worcester. This was discovered and printed in 1905 by Mr. Gray in his *Shakespeare's Marriage*,¹ also by Mrs. Stopes. The text, which occurs under October 1571, runs as follows:

XXIX DIE eiusdem mensis &c. anno predicto emanavit licencia Simoni Hunt in artibus bacch. docendi literas, instruendi pueros in schola grammaticali in villa de Stratford-super-Avon.

It will be seen that this licence fits exactly into the blank in Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps' *Council Books*. It also clears away at once the erroneous identifications with Thomas and George Hunt, and puts us on a firm foundation for further research. We may now apply to our Simon this entry from Boase's *Oxford University Register*, vol. I., p. 269:

HUNT, SIMON, sup. for B.A. 30 Mar., 1568; adm. 5 Apr; det. 1569. [This means "supplicavit," he applied for the grace of a degree in 1568; was admitted 5 April, and "determined" by a disputation in 1569.]

As to Simon's family, nothing certain is known so far: and, considering how very widely spread the family of Hunt has always been, that uncertainty may long endure, especially as the Parish Registers, beginning in 1558, must be at least ten years too late for Simon's Baptism. Nevertheless they aid us in this way, that they show there were some fairly populous Hunt families in Stratford itself.² Moreover, another Simon Hunt died at Stratford before the year 1598, in fairly affluent circumstances.³ He might well enough have been a relative, perhaps the father of our Simon, whom under these circumstances we may presume to have come from the neighbourhood.

The school-house (figured in Lee's *Stratford*) not only remains to us from the days of Hunt and Shakespeare, but it forms part of the group of "Guild" buildings, built in 1453, or even earlier. There was at Stratford, not only a noble collegiate church, but also a remarkable Guild, with the three-fold name of the Holy Cross, the Blessed Virgin, and St. John

¹ J. W. Gray, *Shakespeare's Marriage, his departure from Stratford, and other incidents in his life*, 1905: p. 108. C. C. Stopes, *Shakespeare's Warwickshire Contemporaries*, 1907, p. 244.

² *Stratford on Avon Parish Registers, I.* (1558 to 1652), printed by the Parish Register Society, 1897. This contains about 80 Hunt baptisms. Halliwell-Phillipps' *Stratford Index*, 1865, to his *Calendar of Stratford Records* also contains many references to Hunt. Mrs. Stopes, p. 244, says that a Simon Hunt became M.A. at Oxford in 1570, but I have not confirmed this.

³ Gray, *Shakespeare's Marriage*, p. 108.

the Baptist, probably a combination of three still older Guilds, which date back to the thirteenth century, and had a fine chapel, which still stands in Church Street, as well as a Guild Hall, a school, and other appurtenances.

It is tempting to say more about these venerable Catholic institutions. Mr. Leach, in the *Victoria County History*, claims that in interest the Stratford School is second to none in the country, and he traces its history at some length back to 1290, at which time it was attached to the great parish church, but was afterwards controlled by the Guild in its palmy days during the fourteenth century. But we must confine ourselves strictly to the scene and to the years of Simon Hunt's labours.

Of that particular time there seems to be only one event on record, and its significance is far from clear. As we have seen, the Chamberlains for Stratford, who were responsible for the upkeep of the school, received from the master in 1573, 6s. 11d., "towards the repayinge of the schole windowes." If we ask, what does that mean? the honest answer must be, that it might signify many things, and does not necessarily mean much. Perhaps we may provisionally accept the significance attached to it by Mr. Leach in the *Journal of Education*, March 1908, for he has studied with attention the school-history of that period:

Window-repairing on an extensive scale is a matter of frequent occurrence in school accounts, and of frequent dispute between schoolmasters and governing bodies. Turbulent youth of the day seem to have broken windows systematically at the "barring out" of the master on going home for the holidays, a sort of saturnalia, often fulminated against, but never put down till our milder age.

According to this conjecture the Chamberlains saw fit to mulct the master in a sum, not inconsiderable for those days, for window-damage on the occasion of some break-up-day festivities. Of course this may be so, though the tone of the brief entry does not suggest such a thing. But while we defer to Mr. Leach's authority, we must not forget that his words are, after all, only suggestions.

William Shakespeare had just turned seven and a half when he came under Simon Hunt, and when he had passed eleven Hunt was gone again. Those four years were the time best suited for grounding, and that was the educational process which the poet owes to our schoolmaster. Judged by results

the work must have been thoroughly well done, for there is a general consensus among modern scholars that Shakespeare was quite well educated. Though his father John signed with his mark only (a sign of inferior education, to say the least of it, received during the early furies of the Reformation when the school was temporarily intermitted), William was a facile writer, having a reading acquaintance with Latin and French, and perhaps a dictionary knowledge of Italian (and possibly also of Greek). Though not bookish, nor encyclopædic, Shakespeare was accurate, and well grounded; intellectual virtues which are held to reflect special credit on the preparatory teachers.

While we must not claim more credit than this for Hunt in respect of Shakespeare, yet of course the young poet was only one of several scores of scholars; one master had at that time to teach all the classes. Those were days, too, when books were rare and relatively expensive, when very much indeed depended on the master's voice. Latin was the chief object of study. Latin was still the *lingua franca* of the world, and the language of our law records: it was also the classical tongue of the much-admired poets Virgil and Horace, of Cicero, Cæsar, and other great authors, whose cult was still at its zenith. Hunt would have taught its accidence, presumably through Lily's Grammar, to the beginners. Those who were more proficient would read and commit to memory page after page of *Sententiæ*, moral sentences, culled either from ancient authors, or from recent classicists like Erasmus. Finally, the master would read with the elder boys not only the then modern Mantuanus,¹ but also the usual Latin classics, especially Seneca and Ovid. Sir Sidney Lee, after a careful study of Shakespeare's schooling, concludes by saying: "The original speech of Seneca and Ovid lay well within Shakespeare's mental grasp."

It is a more delicate task to describe Shakespeare's own attitude towards his masters; and here we think some of our moderns go on an erroneous principle. One phase of Shakespeare's greatness is his entire superiority to talking about himself. Never does he mention his name, his home, his fortunes, or his feelings, or give us those little garrulous confidences about himself which are not altogether out of place, not altogether unbecoming among lesser men. Our moderns rightly insist on Shakespeare's wonderful *truthfulness* of description,

¹ Gian Battista Spagnoli Mantuanus, a Carmelite professor and poet, who died in 1516. Shakespeare calls him the "good old Mantuan!"

but they go too far when they assume that Shakespeare may on every possible occasion be presumed to be *truthfully describing his own experiences*. That is not consistent with his wonderful aloofness to self. So in regard to pedagogues. Shakespeare introduces two or three in his plays, and he makes them all more or less laughable, never heroic, never paragons. Does it therefore follow that he hated or despised Mr. Roche, Mr. Hunt, and his other masters? Surely not. That conclusion would be critically invalid. It is opposed to Shakespeare's noble aloofness. He described pedagogues truthfully indeed, but as they were known to playgoers in that day. The *habitué* of the theatre, then as now, was hardly ever an enthusiast for pedagogy. Even if he had had the most amiable of teachers, he looked back on his schooling as on a necessary evil; and it would have been "bad form" to allude to it, except under a thin veil of mocking jocularly. This must, broadly-speaking, have decided, or at least deeply influenced, Shakespeare's tone about schoolmasters, which is admittedly unfavourable, when considered without descending to particulars.

But if we do descend to particulars we shall find the great character-painter admits more than one type of pedagogue. All indeed have the characteristic failings of their class, they are pedants, and dogmatists—but some are not devoid of humanity and good fellowship. Sir Sidney Lee says:

In the pedantic Holofernes of *Love's Labour Lost*, Shakespeare has portrayed the best type of rural schoolmaster, (as in Pinch [*Comedy of Errors*] he has portrayed the worst)—with freshness and fullness of detail imparted to the former portrait. . . . Holofernes, although of a dry humour, seems well disposed towards his pupils. . . . His creator knew many of the profession, who wielded the rod with discrimination.¹

Mr. Leach, on the other hand, declares too strongly for his idea that Shakespeare must have been poking fun at Hunt under Holofernes. There is in truth no reason for affirming that the dramatist *must* have had one of his own masters in mind, or that Hunt *must* have been the master in question.

With these two important records and their not scanty supplements, we complete our account of Simon Hunt's connection with Stratford and with Shakespeare. *Cras ingens iterabimus æquor.*

J. H. POLLEN.

¹ Lee, *Stratford-upon-Avon*, pp. 191, 198.

THE NEW THOUGHT MOVEMENT

I.

Both he and Lady Sunderbund professed universalism; but whilst his was the universalism of one who would simplify to the bare fundamentals of a common faith, hers was the universalism of the collector.

H. G. Wells, *The Soul of a Bishop*, p. 251.

IN the first week of the month of September, now drawing to a close, the organization known as the International New Thought Alliance held a Congress—the prospectus describes it as a “National Congress”—in the heart of fashionable London.¹ A previous gathering of the same kind took place in 1914, a few weeks before the beginning of the war. So far as data are available, neither congress in point either of numbers or of social distinction seems to have presented a very imposing spectacle. It might have been expected, for example, that on the concluding Sunday of the recent meeting, the name of Miss Lena Ashwell, who was to deliver an address on “Superman” at the Grafton Galleries, would have attracted a large attendance. In point of fact sitting accommodation was not provided for more than two hundred people, and even that accommodation was by no means inconveniently crowded. Again in 1914, as we learn from the published balance-sheet, the total expenses of the week’s congress amounted to £156, nearly two-thirds of which went to defray the cost of advertising and hire of hall. For a national meeting the amount cannot certainly be called excessive. Thus all these New Thought activities seem to be on a small scale when compared with the spacious edifices, the huge expenditure, and the enterprising propaganda of the votaries of Christian Science. None the less it may be seriously questioned whether the Christian Churches have not more to fear from the insidious leaven of the New Thought philosophy, disseminated without method and so to speak irresponsibly, under an endless variety of catch-penny titles,² than from

¹ The very fact that the Centres of New Thought and Higher Thought should have been transferred from the Edgware Road and Courtfield Gardens to Mayfair is not without its significance.

² This matter of titles affords some indication of the mentality of those whom the New Thought leaders aim at attracting. Here are a few gathered almost at random: *Just how to wake the Solar Plexus*; *Joy Philosophy*; *The Mastery of*

all the well-drilled and well-equipped battalions who serve under the banner of the late Mrs. Eddy.

No one who has not looked into the matter can have any idea of the vast literary output which more or less explicitly identifies itself with the principles of New Thought. If we said that in the last twenty years five hundred such works have been published in England and America, we should, I am confident, be well within the mark.¹ No doubt it must be owned that in a good deal of this literature the word New Thought is never directly mentioned, and it is also probable that a large proportion of what is printed bears witness to the vanity of authors rather than to any avidity for knowledge on the part of an impatient public. At both New Thought and Higher Thought Centres, the delivery of addresses is a recognized part of the programme, and when the text of a series of discourses has been laboriously prepared and written out, the desire to see the masterpiece in print must often be irresistible. The profuse sermon literature of past centuries is no doubt to be explained by the same tendency. Thus it is significant that in the case of Christian Science, the ritual of which makes no provision for the delivery of original addresses, we have a much less extensive literature of essays and short discourses.² Again, it is certain that a large proportion of the New Thought output consists of booklets which never see a second edition. But there are on the other hand many which undoubtedly command a large sale. The work called *In Tune with the Infinite*, by Ralph Waldo Trine, which is universally looked upon as belonging to this movement, though,

Being; Every Man a King, or Right in Mind Mastery; He can who thinks he can; Health and Wealth from Within; From Passion to Peace, or the Pathway of the Pure; The Science of Being Well; The Science of Being Great; Financial Success through Creative Thought; Through Science to Realization, or the Human Awakening, &c.

¹ In the *United States Catalog* (sic) of books in print (1 Jan. 1912) some two hundred works are entered under the heading "New Thought," and in the supplements such books are registered at an average rate of some twenty a year. But this classification is very rough and ready. For example, the works of R. W. Trine are not noticed under this heading, though in the minds of many he is the most representative writer of this particular religious movement. My own estimate of 500 is based upon an examination of the *Library Catalogue of the Higher Thought Centre*, 39, Maddox Street, and of the Catalogues of such publishers as L. N. Fowler, W. Rider, &c., together with the advertisements and book notices contained in the *Quarterly Record*, the *Rally*, and other New Thought and Higher Thought publications.

² In the *United States Catalog* referred to in the previous note the entry Christian Science is considerably less congested than the entry New Thought, moreover, in the former case more than half the books mentioned are written from an adverse stand-point, criticizing Christian Science.

if I mistake not, the phrase New Thought does not occur in it, bears in its 1916 edition the imprint "435th Thousand." Other similar works of the same author, e.g., *What all the World's a-Seeking* and *The Greatest Thing ever Known*, have had an almost equally phenomenal sale. Again, two of C. B. Patterson's books, *The Will to be Well* and *Dominion and Power*, reached their tenth and seventh editions respectively as long ago as 1911. So in the same year two works of the English essayist James Allen, written on similar lines, viz., *As a Man Thinketh* and *From Poverty to Power*, were both in their seventh edition. Similarly I find in booksellers' catalogues that that prolific New Thought writer William Walker Atkinson stands with thirty-one books to his credit. The majority of these cost a dollar or over, and no one of them is priced at less than half a dollar. We may be fairly certain that when a man brings out his thirty-first book the publication of the previous thirty has landed him in no financial loss, and that there has in consequence been a very respectable sale of the sort of literature he produces. Similar considerations apply to the work of Mrs. Elizabeth Towne, Christian D. Larson, Mrs. Ursula Gestefeld, Thomas Troward, and a host of others far too numerous to mention in detail.

But what *is* New Thought? some of my readers will ask, possibly after an unsuccessful search for information in all accessible Encyclopædias. It is by no means easy to frame a clear and concise reply. To the critic from without who is struck mainly by its external characteristics, New Thought appears as "an eclectic philosophy of life based on a spirit of optimism and emphasizing psychic control and mental therapeutics," or as "an optimistic system of doctrine and practice based on the general conviction that through a change of mind, or by new thought, outer circumstances may be controlled, if consistent with a universal love." From adepts of the system it is difficult to obtain any statement which is not either utterly baffling in its vagueness, or so wildly comprehensive as to include every influence that can possibly contribute to elevate mankind. Mr. C. Larson is content to define New Thought as "the latest product of growing mind"; Mr. C. B. Patterson declares that "New Thought, as opposed to Old Thought, takes the ground that the truth regarding life and its laws is not to be found in the study of phenomena, but rather in man's inmost consciousness." But for popular purposes this is the sort of compendious description which is put before inquirers:

The object of the New Thought Movement is to develop the latent possibilities in man and to show him that he may through concentration and the Silence (sic) bring Health, Wealth and Happiness into his life. New Thought is neither a sect nor a creed, it simply stands for understanding and inclusion.¹

The remarkable thing is that not even for the shortest term of years or for the narrowest geographical limits can the adepts of this new philosophy remember to be consistent. We are told here that New Thought is "not a sect or a creed," and W. W. Atkinson and others repeat many times that "New Thought is not an organization, it is a mental attitude"; nevertheless in the earliest numbers of *The Rally*, a magazine which describes itself on its title-page as "the Official Organ of the New Thought Extension Work," we find it stated that "the New Thought Church came because men built it with their desires, and it will remain because they can use it as a means to pass Life into Higher unfoldment." So again we are told expressly in a short memoir of Dr. Julia Seton Sears, M.D., that in 1910 she "succeeded in founding in London, what has since become a very flourishing center (sic) under the name of the First New Thought Church and School of London." It seems not unreasonable to argue that the term "Church" almost of necessity presupposes organization and some sort of creed. Returning, however, from this digression we may note that the very prolific and representative teacher, W. W. Atkinson, already mentioned, himself practically admits the impossibility of formulating any definition of New Thought, if only on the ground that "there are many cults and schools claiming allegiance to the New Thought, who (sic) differ very materially from each other in doctrine and details." Indeed he adds that in the fundamental principles in which all agree, they "state these principles in different ways and use apparently contradictory terms."² This is not encouraging for the inquirer, and it is perhaps to give him confidence that Mr. Atkinson after these preliminary hesitations finally breaks out into such dithyrambic language as the following:

WHAT IS THE NEW THOUGHT? Let us see. In the first place it is a name by which is best known that great wave of spiritual

¹ I take this from the advertisement pages of a book, *From the Atom to God*, by Gerda Linde, printed for one of the London New Thought Centres in this present year, 1917.

² *The Law of the New Thought*, p. 9.

and psychic thought that is passing over the world, the sweeping away antiquated dogmas, creeds, materialism, bigotry, superstition, unfaith, intolerance, persecution, selfishness, fear, hate, intellectual tyranny and despotism, prejudice, narrowness, disease and perhaps even death. It is the wave that is bringing us liberty, freedom, self-help, brotherly love, fearlessness, courage, confidence, tolerance, advancement, development of latent powers, success, health and life.¹

If this had not been printed in 1902 one would be tempted to think that such hysterical optimism was the result of a violent effort to shake off the hideous nightmare of the war, just as the good New Thought² or Christian Scientist is instructed to say when a dead rat makes itself unpleasantly perceptible behind the wainscoting, "there *are* no objectionable smells, for all is spiritual and perfect; there *are* no dead animals, for all God's ideas reflect Life and have Life eternal."³ Those who may have assisted at the cinema spectacle entitled "Intolerance" will recognize a type of mentality which seemingly tends to become endemic among the New Thoughters of the United States. One almost feels tempted to believe that the war has come upon us expressly to give these crazy idealists the lie.

The fact is that the whole atmosphere of New Thought is an atmosphere of unrealities. No point, for example, is more constantly insisted upon in the popular expositions of the movement than this idea, which we quote from a short statement to which reference has already been made: "It [the New Thought Church] believes in all Churches, all organizations, all people, without regard to class, creed or colour; it teaches that you can learn its fundamentals and then go back

¹ W. W. Atkinson, *The Law of the New Thought*, p. 11. London, 1902.

² This is not my word; it is received in the very best New Thought circles. See, e.g., Towne, *Fifty-three Experiences*, p. 69.

³ I quote textually from Mr. Rawson's Collection of Recipes to be used in domestic emergencies. This particular emergency is headed in Clarendon type, **Smells from Dead Animals under Boards, &c.** The next one to it is **Drainage out of order.** When that happens you put it right by assuring yourself that "no drains can ever be out of order, because they are channels in consciousness through which God's ideas pass with absolute freedom and absolute ease." Similarly under **Cisterns Leaking**, Mr. Rawson remarks: "This is a common source of trouble. All that one has to do is to realize that 'no cistern can ever burst, all God's ideas are spiritual and perfect . . . no water can ever leave its place because water is an idea of God always in its right place.'" See Mr. Rawson's periodical, *Active Service*, Sept. 8, 1917. p. 1063. As is pointed out in the Miscellanea pages of our present number, this Mr. F. L. Rawson took a prominent part in the recent New Thought Congress.

to your own Church, your own country, and better fulfil Life's destiny." Or to illustrate the same claim from a source which would probably be regarded by sympathizers as more authoritative:

New Thought is not a Church, a cult, or a sect. It recognizes no limitations of any kind, creates no barriers between man and man; it asks no allegiance to creed, form, or personality, and is as much for one race as for another. . . .

New Thought does not come to supersede or to destroy the Christian faith as presented to the world by its Founder. . . . New Thought recognizes that all people and all their religions are in different stages of growth and evolution, and that every stage in human development being a necessary stage should be recognized as such; therefore New Thought does not make war against any religion. It recognizes the absolute right not only of religious bodies but of individuals to work out their Plan of Life according to the knowledge they are in possession of. There can, therefore, be no spirit of judgment, controversy or condemnation of any other body of people, even though they are in apparent opposition to what New Thought teaches.¹

Now, however charitable and large-minded this attitude may appear to the adept, we venture to say that in practical life it is impossible, or at any rate is likely to be as fruitful in contention as unrestrained dogmatism. When the New Thinker explains to the earnest Catholic that to believe in Christ's redemption, or in the existence of hell and the devil, or in papal infallibility, is a deplorable error, but right for him because he cannot help it and will grow out of it, as the cannibal grows out of the practice of eating his captives or the savage out of worshipping his fetishes, the situation is still likely to remain strained. However sweetly such an intimation might be conveyed, the mildest retort which would suggest itself to the honest believer in revelation would probably take the form of something as unparliamentary as "Confound your impudence." The attitude of condescension is hardly more conducive to harmony than virulent abuse. If the New Thinkers suppose that their assumption of intellectual superiority implies no offence, nothing could more conclusively show that in the practical affairs of life they have not yet attained supreme wisdom. The idea of reconciling New Thought and traditional Christianity is a foolish chimera. One has more respect for the discernment of that section of the initiated who plainly see that so far from "believing in

¹ C. B. Patterson, *What is New Thought?* pp. 14-16. (New York, 1916.)

all Churches," New Thought is in acute conflict with their very essence. Mr. Abel Leighton Allen, an American writer, whose work has been described as the best exposition of this new philosophy which has yet appeared, and who has also contributed the article on the subject contained in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*,¹ appeals conclusively to the teaching of the creeds—the Apostles' Creed alone would suffice.

The creeds [he says] both of the older and newer churches after the Reformation continued substantially the same, and they remain the same to-day. . . . The three basic ideas are the fall of man, the vicarious atonement and an absolute belief in these propositions. . . . The adherents of New Thought cannot accept these views of orthodox theologians for two reasons; first because they do not rest on any adequate or sufficient historical basis, secondly because these dogmas find their only support in the theory and supposition of the separation of God from Man, which the advocates of New Thought cannot admit or concede.²

So again the same writer declares in set terms that the philosophy he expounds "excludes such doctrines as the duality of man and God, miracles in the accepted sense, the vicarious atonement, the forgiveness of sins and priestly meditation."³ It is in every way desirable that this antagonism should be clearly stated, and we are grateful to Mr. A. L. Allen for his frankness. But a very large number of the exponents of New Thought approximate, like Lady Sunderbund, to the collector's conception of Universalism, and, regardless of all logic and common sense, disseminate such nonsense as the following:

New Thought is constructive; and will destroy nothing as it condemns nothing. Its open-armed welcome to those of every class, creed and colour, has drawn into the movement a motley crowd; and New Thought is seeking to harmonise these, just as every note in a chord of music is harmonised; as the varied tints of a landscape create the glorious beauty of the scene, or as the perfume of every flower in your garden mingles to make glad the heart of man.⁴

Despite this and other similar professions of universal tolerance a very considerable proportion of New Thought

¹ Vol. IX. (1917), p. 359. article "New Thought."

² A. L. Allen, *The Message of New Thought* (New York, 1914), pp. 15, 16

³ *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, IX. 359.

⁴ Miss M. Douglas Fox in *The Rally*, Feb. 1917. p. 5.

literature is full of extremely outspoken condemnations of beliefs and practices with which the greater part of the Christian world has been for centuries identified. Naturally the tenets and the past history of the Church of Rome supply the illustrations for most of these diatribes, generally formulated with scrupulous consideration for the Protestant susceptibilities of the average New England reader, but there are also occasions when the views animadverted upon have nothing to do with schools of theology. Perhaps I may be pardoned for giving in full a rather striking example of this latter class of strictures, which illustrates the extreme self-confidence in the rightness and finality of his own judgments characteristic of the convinced New Thought:

Yet the world did not believe Jesus, nor do his professed followers believe him even to this day. Our Christian civilizations still follow the law of Moses and reject the teaching of Jesus. Society still persists in murdering men, because they murdered other men. We still practise the law of retaliation, the *lex talionis*, an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. When did the orthodox churches, whether Greek Catholic, Roman Catholic or Protestant, ever enter a protest against the horrible spectacle of capital punishment? We assume the right of taking human life which God only can give. Society in sending the homicide to the gallows or the electric chair, effectually declares him unfit to live in their commonwealth, although deprived of citizenship and confined behind bars at hard labour for the remainder of his life; yet it always implores God to accept him in heaven, restored to his liberty and citizenship, that he may there become a resident and permanent inhabitant. Society says he is not good enough for us, but recommends him as worthy of a place in heaven.

What would Jesus say to the proposition of hanging or electrocuting men, who said to the woman, "Go, sin no more"? Could you conceive of him installing an electric chair or adjusting the hangman's noose? You say this is blasphemy. Is it? Jesus never shrank from the performance of a duty. He would not enact a law that he was not willing to execute.

Has any religious convention or conference or synod or any of their branches ever raised a voice against capital punishment? The horrible tragedies are still enacted. . . . At any time during the last thousand years the Church could have caused its abolishment, had it so desired, but the Church loved Moses more than Jesus. We read of 6,000 executions in one nation during one administration, although the Church and State are united. It is only as men have broken away from Church domination and

become independent that they have become charitable enough to abolish the death penalty even for larceny.¹

The weakness of the logic and the inconclusiveness of the illustrations in this tirade may be left to speak for themselves. The writer is the same Mr. A. L. Allen whose frankness, in contrast to the evasive attitude of other exponents of the same views, was commended above. We need have no quarrel with Mr. Allen because he speaks his mind, or even because he denounces doctrines of the Church, which, he declares, are established "by an appeal to ignorance and superstition under the mighty weapon of ecclesiastical authority."² But even Mr. Allen is not above conciliating the prejudices of his Protestant readers by an adherence to verbal forms which in his mouth mean something quite different from their common acceptance. We do not doubt that he, in common with the Christian Scientists and the adherents of all the derived cults, has a profound veneration for the person and teaching of Jesus Christ. There is no reason to question his sincerity when he writes:

But some one asks if the advocates of New Thought believe in and accept the divinity of Jesus? Yes. They go even farther than their orthodox friends in accepting that divinity. They do not require the performance of miracles as a necessary step to prove the divinity of that gentle soul. They see divinity in every act of his life. . . .

I lay no stress upon the omission of the usual capital letter from He, His, etc.; but surely the passage which immediately follows renders the previous profession of faith devoid of all practical meaning.

They see divinity also in every man—slumbering, perhaps, and only waiting to be called forth into development and expression. . . . They regard man as possessing the potential attributes of divinity within himself and that he is conscious of these divine qualities that make him man; that it is man's privilege, duty and function to develop these qualities.³

Is it possible to describe this explanation as anything better than a quibble? Christ was divine because the potentialities which exist equally in every man were carried by Him to the

¹ A. L. Allen, *The Message of New Thought*, pp. 190—192.

² *Ibid.* p. 214.

³ A. L. Allen, *Message of New Thought*, pp. 39—41.

highest stage of "unfoldment"—I use the word which New Thought writers particularly affect. But in this sense we are all divine, or, as others put it, "there is but one Self, the God of all Being, expressed as the Christ."¹ The desire by some trick of phrase to score a hit and to appear to go one better than Christianity, manifests itself in many New Thought writers to an extent that is almost puerile, or, should we not rather say—in view of the fact that the female initiates outnumber the male in the proportion of nearly ten to one—distinctively feminine. Nothing, it would seem, could more completely strike at the root of the ordinary conceptions of personality, whether in God or man, than the pantheistic principles with which New Thought identifies itself, and yet prominence is given to statements like the following:

God is all that we can conceive of a personal God, and more; *He is the personal God without the limitations of personality.* He comprises all that we have learned to look for in a personal God, and more.²

What "the limitations of personality" are the writer does not explain.

One thing in any case comes out clearly for all who will take the trouble to investigate the literature of this the latest and vaguest of the substitutes for Christianity. So far from being the ally and well-wisher of the Churches—and particularly of the Catholic Church—in their struggle against current materialism, the main effort of New Thought is consciously or unconsciously directed to undermining their influence. It is not a little significant that in the Library Catalogue of the London Higher Thought Centre, while there is hardly a book which could be described as a defence of orthodox theism,³ the works of such writers as Haeckel, Samuel Laing, Clodd, etc., are abundantly, even if not exhaustively, represented. Reference has been made above to the great popularity of the books of Ralph Waldo Trine. This gentleman, who is certainly not the victim of any false sense of modesty, and who writes "I had rather be an amanuensis of the Infinite God, as it is my privilege literally to be, than a

¹ Annie Rix Militz, *What is New Thought?* p. 6.

² W. W. Atkinson, *Law of New Thought*, p. 78.

³ There is hardly a Catholic book in the whole library. One or two mystical writers like Ruysbroek and Brother Lawrence are represented by Protestant collections of extracts.

slave to the formulated rules of any rhetorician," is never tired of taking orthodox Christianity to task and of denouncing "the man-made theological dogmas that have held and are holding and limiting so many."¹ Thus in one of the more recent of his numerous works, *The New Alinement* (sic) *of Life*, Mr. Trine delivers himself of what is practically a formal indictment of Catholicism, telling his readers that it is "strange and pitiable that in practically every great advance in the world's thought, the Church has had to put itself on the defensive, and has fought, only to be beaten, as it invariably has been."² But not to multiply such citations indefinitely let me take one other passage which illustrates at the same time the strangely slipshod English in which many of these New Thought utterances are couched. I take the liberty to italicize one recurring word:

In this, as in many other wholesale persecutions and burnings, we find ignorance and fanaticism on the one hand leagued with Rome's traditional money greed on the other. The money itch on the *part* of her governing classes was so prominent and so conspicuous a *part* of her very life for two or three centuries immediately preceding her downfall and dissolution, that it became and continued at least until the time of the Reformation, an integral *part* of the religious organisation that was given birth and formation to by her in the early *part* of the fourth century.³

One would have expected a writer whose works sell by the hundred thousand to have a little more sense of literary form. Although this is, of course, a detail of quite subsidiary importance, it is curious that both Mrs. Eddy and Mr. R. W. Trine, who claim to represent the last word of intellectual culture, should convey so strong an impression of defective education. But for the present enough has been said. In a second and concluding article I propose to discuss the positive tenets of the New Thought movement and to give some idea of the character of that entourage of sympathizers which it has created for itself in America and in this country.

HERBERT THURSTON.

¹ *In Tune with the Infinite*, Chapter 8.

² Trine, *The New Alinement of Life* (1913), p. 90.

³ *Ibid.* p. 61.

A FISHER OF MEN

"Quid erit nobis?"

PETER is Peter and John is John,
Thomas is Thomas—but what am I?
Hungry and weary we wander on,
Under a burning sky.

Peter he speaks and the Lord will hear,
John has a claim no man denies,
Thomas may question till all comes clear,
And smiling the Lord replies.

Thirsty and dusty, tired and worn,—
Hard are the ways of this Galilee!
Harder the priests in their acrid scorn,—
Oh—why did the Lord call me?

Why did I look in that thoughtful Face,
Till life grew dreary, the sun turned dim?
I flung down the oar with an evil grace,
Yea—grumbling I came to Him.

Leaving the task where I worked with zeal!
And what am I doing a-wandering here?
What have I netted—'tis that I feel—
Who've followed the Lord a year?

Walks He with me in the eventide
Even as He does with the tall young John?
No—and 'tis Peter who seeks His Side
When pestering folk are gone.

Speaks He with me? Oh, not twice a day!
Burning my feet, and my eyes are sore,
There is my boat—shall I turn away
And walk with the Lord no more?

Waves that uplift her, the cooling wind,
Brown sail a-straining, the waters sweet!
What is the joy that these land folk find?
Why goes a man on his feet?

Thomas and Peter and all the rest—
Easy for favourites to serve, I say!
But I follow the Lord at His Own behest
I follow the harder way!

And I doubt and waver, for life is rough
The roads are rugged, the toils increase,
But—the best of me says:—The Lord is enough,
His ways are the ways of peace!

M. G. CHADWICK.

SOCIALISM AND THE WAR

NEVER since the outbreak of this calamitous war has the actual scene and its probable issue been more confused than they are at present. Were it not for the Russian revolution and the entry into the conflict of the United States, the Allies ere this would surely have reiterated and defined their war-aims in clear and authoritative terms. But Russia is not yet in a position to speak as a moral unit. The Government, which entered the war before any other of the Allies, has disappeared and there is nothing yet to replace it effectively. We do not even know yet whether the newly-constituted Democratic Republic of Russia, when it becomes a reality as well as a name, will consider itself bound by the Pact of London. Such indications of purpose as the *de facto* Russian Government gives differ materially from the Allied programme. Nor does America, which has not formally joined the Alliance, see exactly eye to eye with it. We must hope that in the near future a re-statement of our objects will be made which will show that the Allies want only one thing—the effective and permanent vindication of justice—and are in the main agreed as to how that is to be secured. Mere lapse of time and the conflicting demands from various unauthorized sources, both Jingo and pacifist, have done much to obscure the issue; a certain very natural and excusable war-weariness has done something to weaken our energy; and the tremendous reverberations of the Russian revolution have, as we shall see, greatly impaired our unity. For the first time since the war began many are asking themselves—is a military decision—"a knock-out blow"—really possible? That it is not is evidently the view taken in his Peace Note by the Holy Father, an impartial observer, with ample means of knowing the resources of both sides, and one who does not yield to anyone in his desire for a *just* and lasting peace. However reluctant one may be to admit the fact, it is fairly certain that in every country that doubt is more or less prevalent. The late German Chancellor confessed in a letter to Professor Harnack that Germany could now only hope for a draw. France is being deluged with anti-war literature. One has only to read the English labour papers to realize that there is a growing sense amongst their audience of the futility of further con-

flict. An international journalist called Dr. Dillon, who has taken on the functions and shares the fate of Cassandra, has a very pessimistic article in the current *Fortnightly*,¹ the conclusion of which is that the Allies' aims can be achieved only by many further years of exhaustive conflict and a complete but improbable union of parties in each Entente country. We may continue to disbelieve Dr. Dillon: the bias and ignorance he displays whenever he touches upon Vatican affairs effectually discredit him as a seer; but he is reckoned by many as a well-informed man and has the *entrée* into the best reviews. Those who read only *The Times* and the "official" metropolitan press are living in a fool's paradise as regards the condition of public opinion. There is plenty of criticism of the Government in all papers, and plenty of grounds for criticism, but there is also deep-seated opposition in the working-class and radical press, not only to its methods of conducting the war but also to the aims it is supposed to have in view.

This is distressing to those who hold that freedom itself is at stake, that Germany is a criminal aggressor deeply stained with blood-guiltiness both in end and means, that, until atonement is made, repentance expressed and securities taken against future crime, the cause of morality will remain grievously wounded and the peace of the world in continual jeopardy. There should be no room for misunderstanding in so momentous a matter. The Allies have declared by their responsible spokesmen that they have no desire to crush Germany either now or hereafter. If this or that scheme of dismemberment or boycotting is set forth by journalist-politicians, the aim of such schemes is always reparation and guarantees. Could these ends be secured otherwise, no one would be justified in suggesting the internal reform of the Teutonic powers. It is well known that President Wilson dissociates the bulk of the German people from the crimes of their rulers: it is significant that Mr. Lloyd George said at Glasgow (June 29th) that

we could enter into negotiations with a free Government in Germany with a different attitude of mind, a different temper, a different spirit, with less suspicion, with more confidence, than we could with a Government whom we know to be dominated by the aggressive and arrogant spirit of Prussian militarism, and the Allied Governments would in my judgment be acting wisely if they drew that distinction in their general attitude in the discussion of the terms of peace.

¹ Counting the Cost." By Dr. E. J. Dillon.

Those of us who do not believe that a whole nation can become corrupt, and who have known the sterling good qualities of our German fellow-Catholics, now inadequately represented by their political leaders and their controlled press,¹ are convinced that our co-religionists at least are not consciously abetting a mad and unchristian scheme for power or approving the many enormities to which it has given rise. Indeed, anyone who realizes from his own experience here in a more or less democratic country to what extent Government censorship can hamper the acquisition of facts, may easily understand what a military despotism can do in the way of deluding its subjects. And there has been enough loose ethics displayed by our own journalists, enough too of England-ueber-Alles spirit, to make us chary of attaching too much significance to the State-moulded press-opinions of our foes. Germans who have escaped from their national environment, like Herr Fernau, Herr Rosemaier, and the anonymous author of *J'accuse*, feel and express just as much abhorrence of the Prussian code of morals and politics as the most virtuous of the Allies. We do not despair of that impression becoming general amongst their fellow-countrymen, once a knowledge of the truth has reached them and Hohenzollernism becomes recognizable by its fruits.

The view that the 70 millions of German people and the inhabitants of the Austrian Empire also are collectively guilty of the crimes of Prussianism and consciously imbued with the anti-Christian political philosophy from which they issue, will be seen on analysis to rest on vague historical generalities, deductions from an inadequate array of instances. As we have often pointed out, nothing could be easier than to frame a similar indictment against each and every one of the Allies by judicious selections from their histories. Every nation has a past, in some cases coming very near to the present, which has to be lived down. And though we are convinced that in the present conflict we are upholding the cause of God and Christian civilization, it would do none of us any harm if, on occasion, we combined with our denunciations of our enemies' enormities in diplomacy or in the field an acknowledgment of the similar sins of our ancestors. Our present regard for the sacrosanct character of formal treaties is of somewhat modern growth. Much has been made of the recent disclosure of the

¹ See article on "German Catholics and the War," in THE MONTH for September.

cynical plotting of Kaiser and Tzar in 1905 against European peace. But the designs of these two potentates were innocence itself compared with the wholly immoral machinations of Cavour, Palmerston and Napoleon III. against Austria and the Papal States in 1856. In fact, the diplomacy of Europe during the Congress of Paris in that year was so wholly devoid of honest principle that Lamartine could describe its issue with truth as "a declaration of war under the signature of peace, the corner-stone of European chaos, the end of public right in Europe." We are hoping for a change of heart in the German people, let us give them every assurance that our own is changed. Pan-Germanism needs no better justification than Pan-Slavism or Pan-Anglicism. In this war, as has often been said, we are fighting a philosophy, an attitude of mind. Arms must be encountered by arms, but error can only be worsted by truth, injustice by justice. Hence the need of proclaiming and *proving* that it is not for territorial or commercial aggrandisement we are fighting but for the re-establishment and final security of public morality, and therefore, as a preliminary, for the destruction of the system that rejects such an aim. That we should make known to friend and foe alike. That is an object which should unite all honest men,—how is it that our unity and our energy seem to be weakening? There are many causes, but the chief is the misguided activities of Socialism.

To careful observers it must seem that the "social revolution" which, the prophets say, is to occur on the establishment of peace has not awaited that event. In Russia it is already triumphant: in other Entente countries the signs of its coming are manifest. The various Governments have thus a double task laid upon them—the maintenance of vigorous hostilities and the safeguarding of internal harmony,—a task complicated by the fact that those who threaten peace at home are the very persons on whom depends the continuance of war abroad. We must realize the fact that our very insistence upon the loftiness of our ideal and the purity of our motive have prompted the enquiries amongst thoughtful citizens—if justice is your aim abroad, why do you not practise it at home? if you denounce the national self-seeking which has plunged the whole world into arms, why is selfishness so rampant in all your domestic relations? The utmost exertions of the Government are seen to be necessary in order to prevent, in the very heart of this heroic conflict, the exploita-

tion of class by class, the grinding of the faces of the poor on the part of tradesmen and manufacturers. What wonder that the zeal for law and justice and righteousness, undoubtedly awakened and stimulated by the portentous crimes of our foes, should try to find scope for exercise in our own unchristian surroundings! Hence the feeling amongst those who have to bear the brunt of the fighting and to supply the daily wastage of life that the country they are dying for should be made more worth living in: hence the readiness of their response to the appeal of international Socialism.

A word may be said here about the history and character of this international working-class movement which, in its origin at least, was not socialistic, although Karl Marx had much to do with its later development. It took its rise in London on the occasion of the Great Exhibition of 1862, which itself was intended to promote internationalism and universal peace. The growth, instead, of Socialism was one, perhaps unexpected, result, but clearly it is as right and reasonable for the working classes all over the world to meet and discuss their class interests as it is for religious parties, or scientific men, or temperance reformers, or any other bodies which have a universal character. The evil consequences of such international gatherings arise from the existence in any community of large sections who consider that their interests are in some way opposed to those of the community as a whole. That is eminently the case with socialists everywhere who look upon Governments which sanction private property as radically unsound. Owing to our prolonged adherence to "Manchester" economics, it is the case too with the working-class generally, the hand-labourers and the wage-earners, who have not hitherto been allowed to occupy their rightful place in the life of the community. This explains why Labour, which as a whole is not socialistic, so readily allies itself with socialist organizations,¹ and why in all Labour associations the small socialist minority is apt to dictate the policy of the whole body. Accordingly, the "International Working Men's Association" became more and more socialistic and revolutionary, notably after its inclusion in 1869 of Bakunin and a number of Russian nihilists. After the overthrow of the Commune, which it

¹ The Executive Committee of the Labour Party in the course of their memorandum on Peace and War assert "that the proposals made for the security of peace in this memorandum will be made more secure if the Socialist International is reconstituted."

approved, in 1871, it became thoroughly discredited. The Bakunists split from the Marxians, and neither party survived the seventies.

A new International made its appearance in Paris in 1889 which was definitely socialistic in character, and made the "conquest of public powers by the proletariat organized as a class party" its main object: it allowed, however, the affiliation of all non-political bodies "which accept the principle of a class struggle." This body founded an International Socialist Bureau at Brussels which arranges Congresses at intervals of about three years. The last was due in Vienna in the autumn of 1914! With this body, whose functions are practically suspended during the war, the British Labour Party is affiliated. The British Labour Party is a federation consisting of Trade Unions, the Independent Labour Party, the Fabian Society, and a large number of Trades Councils and local Labour bodies. The membership of the Trade Unions in the Party is over 2,000,000: that of the two socialist bodies—the I.L.P. and the Fabians—about 35,000. Thus we see, here again, the influence of an energetic minority in dictating policy. It is a pity that the rank and file of the working-class should in default of more responsible leaders be induced to ally themselves in their pursuit of justice with a revolutionary body, the programme of which is condemned not only by religious principle but by all sound systems of politics and economics. It is more than a pity: it is a reproach and a danger to the State, which, in the midst of a life-and-death struggle, is thus faced with the possibility of internal disruption. The past two months, with all the events that centred round the Stockholm proposals, have shown to what a perilous pass we have come.

If "Labour Unrest" was the powder-magazine it was the Russian Revolution that applied the match. It is practically impossible to sketch the history of that revolt, so wide is the sphere of our ignorance, so doubtful the modicum of our knowledge. Even the Government, who have sent thither special emissaries of every colour, appear to be at a loss to understand the situation. What seems clear is that a movement, which no one who knows what Tzardom was can regret, has passed from the guidance of the soberer and more moderate elements in the State into the control of extremists, wholly devoid of knowledge of statesmanship or capacity for constructive work. The result is, naturally, anarchy, a multiplicity of conflicting ideals, a demoralized Army, a series of

defections from the body of the State, a resulting weakness which could offer no effectual resistance to the Germans, if the latter had now the resources and power to pursue their conquests even to Petrograd. Socialists of every degree are now in possession of Russia: whether the other classes in the population can regain their proportionate influence in the Government remains to be seen. But from the nature of the case a Socialist Government can admit no association with advocates of a different system, for socialism is not democracy but merely despotism in another guise.

From the most socialistic of the several quasi-Governments which the Revolution in Russia had thrown up came an invitation to the socialists of the world to assemble at Stockholm on August 15th and debate about peace. We can trace here the activity of the International Socialist Bureau, which has migrated from Brussels to Holland and is partly officered by Dutch Socialists. There can be little doubt that German Socialists were employed by their Government to assist the movement, not, we may presume, in the interests of Socialism. In fact, the original suggestion came from Germany but got no support amongst the Entente till the Russians backed it. Thus, the occasion of this deadly struggle, on the issue of which depends the very existence of free communities throughout the world, has been seized by these purblind fanatics to inaugurate their crusade against the *bourgeoisie*, that cant French term which they apply to all who do not share their views. They classify all the Governments engaged in the war, including the French and American republics, as "imperialist," and declare that the war is being prolonged in the interests of capitalists. They want under cover of zeal for "human brotherhood" to restore the whole revolutionary and predatory programme of the *Internationale*.

The portent of Stockholm, then, is simply this. It is an organized attempt of sections of the population of different countries, sections in all cases numerically small, to decide the destinies of those countries without the authorization of the bulk of their inhabitants. It may be a natural result of the bygone practice of ignoring the working-classes in settling international questions, but one wrong is not corrected by another. During war it is an act of treason to enter into friendly communication with the enemy without the authorization of one's own Government.¹ Such "fraternization" is

¹ The Executive of the Catholic Women's League, accordingly, were quite right on constitutional grounds in lately refusing to meet members of similar

punishable by death in the field, yet for weeks and months the French and British Governments allowed the proposed Socialist gathering at Stockholm to be discussed as an open question. It was only in August that the Cabinet ventured to declare the law in the following terms:

The law officers of the Crown have advised the Government that it is not legal for any person resident in His Majesty's dominions to engage in a conference with enemy subjects without the licence of the Crown duly given. The Government have decided that permission to attend the [Stockholm] Conference shall not be granted and the same decision has been taken by the Governments of the United States, France and Italy with whom the Government have been in communication.¹

It was only in that month that the Prime Minister put his foot down by declaring—

We cannot allow sectional organizations to direct the war or to dictate peace.²

It is significant of the influence that socialism has been able to exert on the European Governments that the decision should have been so delayed. To allow any section of their subjects to discuss with alien enemies, even academically, matters which are the primary concern of the Government itself representing the whole people would be surely to abdicate its own functions. To give such permission to bodies whose express aim is the subversion of all existing systems of Government would be little short of suicide.

It is also noteworthy that, whereas the democracies were unanimous, however dilatory, in refusing to allow themselves to be superseded by sectional interests, the autocracies were all in favour of the proposed conference. The pseudo-Socialist *Vorwärts*, which has been allowed to exist on condition that it supports the German Government, characterizes the refusal of passports as "England's war on the International," and contrasts the liberal policy of Germany which put no obstacle in the way of her socialists going to Stockholm.³ No better indication, it seems to us, could be desired of the German Government's need for peace.

organizations belonging to enemy countries, but they weakened their case by giving as a reason the assumed culpable complicity of those members in their countries' crimes.

¹ Mr. Bonar Law in the House of Commons.

² Queen's Hall Speech, August 4th.

³ Germany can afford to disregard her Socialists except as tools, for according to the *Vorwärts*'s own statistics, the membership of the Majority party has fallen from 1,085,905 in March, 1914, to 243,061 in March, 1917.

In every country on the side of the Entente socialists have consistently opposed this struggle of the democracy for the future of civilization. In the United States the whole socialist press is against America's participation in what the party describes, in spite of President Wilson's inspiring declarations of high principle, as "the most unjustifiable war in the history of the world." In France, the socialists are a grave source of weakness to the Government. In Italy a socialist plot has been discovered (v. *The Times*, Sept. 20th) to make peace independently of the Government. In this country the working-classes, after much vacillation, finally shook themselves free of the socialist incubus and declared emphatically against Stockholm at the Trades Union Congress on Sept. 5th. Alone the Belgian socialists, for reasons easily conjecturable, have not failed to appreciate the menace of Prussianism and have remained thoroughly loyal and patriotic.

For the moment, therefore, the attempt of the *Internationale* to exploit the world-war in order to establish everywhere the Red Republic has failed. In no country except Russia has it been able to capture the Government or to dictate its attitude. But it will surely try again, and the only way in which it can be finally defeated is by the several Governments adapting and fostering whatever is sound in its programme. Democracy must become more of a reality. Such vital questions as foreign relations cannot be left wholly in the hands of a few diplomatists. The lives of the "common folk" must no longer be at the mercy of ambitious rulers to be sacrificed for sordid commercial aims. And the deplorable class-antagonism which the same evil spirit of avarice stirs up in each community must be allayed by the removal of its cause—the exploitation of human beings to make money. As long as modern conditions of industry make it possible to gamble in the necessities of life so that middlemen can grow rich whilst the poor starve, as long as the State tolerates and even facilitates "sweating," bad housing, and the other abominations of the present economic regime, so long will it be regarded by the worker as something opposed to his rightful interests and undeserving of his allegiance. The frequency with which the words, "the Capitalist State," occur in socialist speeches and publications shows where the grievance lies. The universal testimony of the Commission on Industrial Unrest, that that phenomenon is traceable to the existence of profiteering, points in the same direction. The State exists to protect property, the worker argues; but the State does nothing to

help the worker to acquire property; therefore the State looks after the interests only of the property-owners. The logic is faulty but the conclusion is widespread, and can only be upset by the adoption of Leo XIII.'s counsel. "When there is question," says that wise Pope, "of defending the rights of individuals, the poor and the helpless have a claim to *especial* consideration . . . the wage earners who are undoubtedly among the weak and necessitous should be *specially* cared for and protected by the Government."¹

The longest, most thorough, and most important of the Reports of the recent Commission dealing with the Causes of Labour Unrest—that concerning Wales and Monmouthshire—states frankly that "the problem is fundamentally a human and not an economic problem," and that "a new spirit of partnership is essential." To that task the energies of all those employed on Reconstruction should be bent. The community for the moment is united owing to the external pressure of war; but internal bonds of union must be strengthened or established if peace is not to be followed by internecine strife.

We have denounced the Stockholm Conference as, in the circumstances, a socialist trick, but we must not be taken to deny that many of the ideals in its programme are worthy and Christian ideals. Universal peace based upon universal regard for justice, the abolition of militarism and Imperialism, *i.e.* of the State organized for conquest and aggression, the recognition of the dignity and human rights of Labour, the abolition of privilege and power without responsibility, the safeguarding the integrity and independence of national entities—all these things, properly understood, are the desire of all sane men. And if Labour can further them by international intercourse, Labour should not be prevented from doing so. But in that case, in time of war, Labour should go to speak with the foreigner duly accredited by its own Government and therefore representing the whole community. It should not parley as a sectional interest opposed to the rest of its fellow-citizens.² It has no more right to become an *imperium in imperio* than has any other body in the State.

J. KEATING.

¹ *The Condition of the Working Classes* (C.T.S. Edit.), p. 29.

² An *obiter dictum* of M. Thomas, the French Socialist leader, reveals the Socialist mentality. Speaking of a certain line of policy he used the words: "From the national point of view as well as from the Socialist point of view." (*Times*, Aug. 15, 1917.)

MISCELLANEA

I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

DR. GEORGE BOISSARIE, R.I.P.

IN the records of contemporary Catholicism the story of Lourdes will always hold a prominent place. A characteristic of the nineteenth century was the persistent, and in its own estimation triumphant, war of Rationalism against belief in the supernatural, which it claimed to have put out of court altogether, by demonstrating that it rested on the purest assumptions and indeed was hopelessly inconsistent with the conclusions of science. In the forefront of this conflict between Rationalism and Catholicism was the question of miracle, but while the Rationalist brushed aside very confidently every story of alleged miracle as the fruit of a credulous age long since passed away, the story of Lourdes and its unfailing stream of miracles was contemporary, and was coming ever more and more to the front as the century drew to its close; till at length even men of recognized scientific reputation were forced to pay serious attention to its cures, and in not a few cases to acknowledge that they found them inexplicable by suggestion, or indeed by any natural process that they knew of or could conceive of.

It was Bernadette Soubirous in the first place who was God's instrument in directing attention to these wonders at Lourdes, by the part which she herself was ordained by God to play in inaugurating the long series, but among those who took a leading part in forcing the attention of the scientific world upon these wonders was Dr. Boissarie, whose death occurred on June 28th of this year. We borrow from the *Annales de N. D. de Lourdes* (for June—July) the main facts which mark the stages of his work for the famous sanctuary. George Boissarie was born at Sarlat in 1837. He was the son of Dr. Lucien Boissarie, who practised medicine in that neighbourhood. The son was educated for the same profession and attained considerable distinction in his preparatory studies. He became the favourite pupil in his day of medical lights like Jobert de Lamballe and Velpeau, who tried their best to keep him in Paris, where they assured him

his clinical sense and his professional aptitudes promised him a brilliant career. This prognostication was further confirmed by the success with which he discharged the function of corresponding member of several medical societies, particularly of the Société de Chirurgie. He preferred, however, to return to his own neighbourhood, where for the time he took over his father's practice and in due course married and had five sons, each of whom has acquired distinction in the career of his choice.

It was in the late eighties, as he has told us himself, that Boissarie was first attracted to Lourdes and came to know of its Bureau des Constatations. It seemed to him to furnish a precious opportunity of applying to the cures that were continually being wrought the best tests that human science could offer. This Bureau had been established for that purpose a few years before by the enterprise of Pere Sempé, the Superior of the Missionaries of Lourdes, to whose spiritual care the sanctuary had been confided. The first president appointed to conduct its investigations had been the Baron Dunot de St. Maclou, a man well qualified, both medically and theologically, for the post. But when he died in 1891 Dr. Boissarie, who had got into the way of coming continually to the town to join in the investigations of the Bureau, was felt by all concerned to be the man marked out to be the next occupant of the post, and from 1891 onwards till the other day, when advance of years and failing health made it impossible for him to continue, he has been almost identified with the post and as such known throughout the world. From the day of his entry into office he carried on the work of the Bureau on the sound lines which his predecessor had established, but developed the work considerably. He was a man of firm faith, but equally firm in his conviction that true miracles should be able to bear the most rigorous application of scientific tests, indeed should not only be prepared to bear them but should invite their application so far as the opportunities allowed. Being also himself a competent man of science he knew how to put his scientific confrères at their ease by giving them every facility for taking part in the investigations, to which they were invited whenever they could be induced to come to the Bureau. As they got gradually to know what kind of man they had to deal with the medical experts from all lands were attracted towards a place which in any case offered to their researches the finest clinical

material in existence, and the number of visitors of this class steadily increased, so that, according to the notice in the *Annales*, as many as 7,778 such visitors came and took part in the investigations during the twenty-three years of Dr. Boissarie's term of office, a goodly few of them being men of high standing in their profession.

Soon after his arrival at the Bureau occurred the well-known visit of Zola, who came with the confident expectation that he would be able to detect the fraud and expose it in his next novel. Every opportunity of investigating was allowed him, but in his *Lourdes* he was guilty of a gross misrepresentation by altering the facts so as to make the cures appear to have been very fleeting and unreal, and yet conveying the impression to his readers that he had found them so at Lourdes. Dr. Boissarie two years later brought to Paris three of the *miraculées* who had been thus misdescribed by Zola, and at a public meeting at the Luxembourg created quite a sensation by giving the audience an ocular demonstration of the glaring conflict between the truth and Zola's fabrication. This incident led to the holding of annual meetings at Paris, at which Dr. Boissarie was accustomed to bring the subjects of some of the most interesting miracles of the year, while in their presence carefully documented studies of their cures were read by distinguished physicians. Needless to say these annual meetings had a progressive effect in making known the thoroughly scientific and powerful proofs that could be advanced on behalf of many of the Lourdes miracles. It will be remembered that the Eucharistic Congress of 1914 was being held at Lourdes when the present war first broke out. It was Dr. Boissarie's last public appearance, and it must have been with feelings of consolation that he listened to the remarkable report on the Medical Proof of Miracles then read before the Congress by Dr. Bec, the head surgeon of the Hospital St. Joseph of Paris. As one looks back upon that occasion one is prone to regard it as the seal set on Dr. George Boissarie's life-work for Our Lady of Lourdes. Many a prayer must now be raised heavenwards for this loyal and learned Catholic, who has set us all such an example of the accord of Faith with Reason, and has contributed by his discerning administration of the Bureau such convincing evidence of the Divine Guardianship of the Church. R.I.P.

S. F. S.

DID LUTHER COMPOSE THE TUNE "EIN FESTE BURG"?

WITHIN the past twenty years the career of Luther has been systematically examined and laid bare to the world by such eminent historians as Denifle and Grisar. However, in regard to the arch-reformer as a musician and composer, our estimate has been more or less hampered by the authority of non-Catholic writers such as the most recent *Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, the well-known standard work of the late Sir George Grove, edited by Mr. J. A. Fuller Maitland (Macmillan Company) which presents Luther as a brilliant hymn writer and arranger, and as the "probable composer" of at least 13 hymn-tunes. The writer of the article in the new edition of Grove (1906) is the music librarian of the British Museum, Mr. W. Barclay Squire, who is an acknowledged expert as a musicologist, and he gives a detailed catalogue of some 13 hymn-tunes "probably composed by Luther."

Mr. Squire, however, cautiously adds his own opinion that "of the above tunes, Nos. 1 and 2 are almost without doubt by Luther; Nos. 3 to 8 are very probably by him; and Nos. 9 to 13 are ascribed to him with less certainty."

It is not my intention to deal *seriatim* with the 13 tunes attributed to Luther, but many of Mr. Squire's deductions are based on insufficient knowledge, as is evident from the Bibliography which accompanies his article, and which, as he says, "has been carefully consulted." It is merely necessary to mention that he does not include such recent authorities as Zahn, Zelle, Bohme, Bäumker, Chevalier, Kade, Frere, and Gastoné, while he ignores the monumental *Analecta Hymnica medii aevi*, by Dreves and Blume (S.J.), of which 54 volumes have appeared (1886—1914).

Before dealing with the hymn-tune "Ein feste Burg," which is the objective of the present paper, the following brief *resumé* of the historical claims of Luther as a composer may be useful. Early Protestant writers unhesitatingly ascribed 70 tunes to Luther. Rambach, in 1813, reduced the number to 32, but gave it as his own considered opinion that only 24 had strong probability in their favour. Dr. Gustav Schelling (who died at Nebraska in 1881) considers the number of tunes that can really be claimed for Luther as but six. Winterfeld (1840) and Mendel (d. 1876) admit but three, a conclusion which is

also arrived at by Reissmann, the continuator of Mendel. Koch, in 1882, is inclined to admit nine tunes. Later writers reduce the number to two. Finally, Otto Kade (who died in 1900) utterly dissipated the traditional pretensions of Luther to be regarded as a composer, and, after a meticulous investigation of the sources of the alleged tunes of the "musical Martin," admitted but one solitary melody, namely, "Ein feste Burg" that seemed to have good grounds for being attributed to him. At the same time, he points out that "probably even this one tune was the work of Walther." Now let us hear Professor Eduard Dickinson, Conservatory of Music, Oberlin College (U.S.A.), in his *Music in the History of the Western Church* (1902): "Luther composed no tunes. Under the patient investigation of a half-century, the melodies originally associated with Luther's hymns have all been traced to their sources. The tune of 'Ein feste Burg' was the last to yield; Bäumker finds the germ of it in a Gregorian melody. Such proof as this is, of course, decisive and final."

As to the origin of the hymn "Ein feste Burg," several theories have been put forward, but it is not improbable that Luther wrote it for the Diet of Speyer, in 1529. As is well known it is a free version of Ps. xlv, but we can dismiss as apocryphal the legend quoted by Heine, in which the "reformer" is said to have composed tune and words as he and his comrades entered Worms on April 16, 1521. Equally apocryphal is the fable set forth by D'Aubigné (*Hist. of the Reformation*, ed. 1847, p. 543) to the effect that Luther actually composed and sang "Ein feste Burg" for the Diet of Augsburg in 1530, a fable sufficiently disproved by the appearance of the hymn and tune in Klug's *Gesangbuch* (1529), in which it was published as "Der xxxvi Ps. Deus noster refugium et virtus." Dr. J. Linke, of Altenburg, in his monograph on this hymn, published at Leipzig, in 1886, endeavours to show that Luther wrote the hymn on or about Oct. 31, 1525, but, as pointed out by my friend, Rev. J. Mearns, in Julian's *Dict. of Hymnology* (1907), the supposition is "very improbable."

Most of the Protestant writers on music strive to claim for Luther the composition of the tune, and this opinion, as we have seen, was not seriously contested till Otto Kade, in 1872, and, later and more fully, Bäumker, overthrew the reformer's pretensions. This view is also held by Schweitzer, in his monograph on *Bach* (1911), and he freely admits that Luther

made use of pre-Reformation melodies, yet, that due credit must be given for the skilful manner in which the reformer adapted the Gregorian themes.

To my mind, one of the strongest proofs against the ascription of the tune to Luther is the positive fact that there were variants of it published in 1530 and in 1531, and again in 1535. The most recent writer on the subject of German Chorals, Dr. A. W. Wilson, M.A., organist of Ely Cathedral, in *Musical Opinion* (Nov. 1913) fully concedes Bäumker's view that "Ein feste Burg" was not actually composed by Luther, but was "a revised form of phrases taken from the Credo and Kyrie of the Missa de Angelis," just as Nicholas Decius (1539) adapted the old plain chant "Et in terra pax" from the "Gloria paschalis" to the tune which he pieced together for his setting of "Allein Gott in der Höh sei Ehr."

Let me adduce another proof from internal evidence that Luther did not compose the tune but merely adapted it. This proof is that the last phrase (four bars) of the melody of "Vom Himmel hoch" is *note for note* the same as the concluding phrase of "Ein feste Burg." Both phrases are a repetition of the opening bars.

But the strongest proof of all is that which is clearly brought out by Dr. Joseph Gotzen in the fourth (posthumous) volume of Bäumker's *Das Katholische deutsche Kirchenlied in seinen Singweisen* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1912). The origin of "Ein feste Burg" which Bäumker at first traced to three phrases from an old plain chant Mass is now more definitely traced to a hymn, "Sponsa Dei speciosa," composed for the feast of St. Margaret, and which is to be found in Hugo von Reutlingen's *Flores musicae omnis cantus Gregoriani*, printed at Strasburg in 1488, when Luther was five years of age. Even a cursory glance at the tune of "Sponsa Dei speciosa" will convince the most sceptical of its identity with the tune "lifted" by Luther, which has been termed "the Marsellaise Hymn of the Reformation," and skilfully treated by Bach, Mendelssohn and Meyerbeer, as also by Wagner in his *Kaiser-marsch*, written on the occasion of the return of Kaiser William in 1871, after the Franco-Prussian War.

Rev. Dr. Frere, in his admirable Introduction to the Historical Edition of *Hymns Ancient and Modern* (1909), candidly admits that Luther "made much use of already existing materials." He adds: "Luther himself was greatly attached

to the old Hymns, Sequences, Antiphons, *Cantiones*, etc; they form the main bulk of the Song Book which Walther presented to him, and the German novelties are relatively few."

Thus, taking into consideration all the available evidence, Luther's claim as composer of the hymn-tune "Ein feste Burg" cannot be sustained. Of course I am aware that Köstlin has freely criticized Bäumker's discoveries, and endeavours to show that Luther would scarcely have taken the trouble to piece together three fragments from plain-song melodies and form a mosaic of them, but the identity of these fragments with the phrases in "Ein feste Burg" is too real to be set aside.

No doubt, the singing of "Ein feste Burg" will form a prominent feature in the German celebrations this month of the quater-centenary of the so-called Reformation. It is some satisfaction to think that in their ignorance the Germans will be singing a paraphrase of a Psalm to a melody from Catholic sources.

W. H. GRATTAN FLOOD.

THE DATE OF THE END OF THE WORLD.

IN the early months of the war we devoted some space to the prophecy-mongers who in such troubled times as those through which we are passing find a golden opportunity for exploiting the religious hopes or fears of the credulous and the anxious-minded. Most of the prophecies with which we previously dealt purported to be modern revelations, emanating from canonized Saints and specially favoured servants of God, and consequently making their more direct appeal to readers of our own faith. But we also made it clear that this superstitious attitude was no monopoly of Catholics. Robust Agnostics, Low Churchmen, and adherents of many eclectic up-to-date cults are every whit as prone to give ear to the charlatans who profess, whether through apocalyptic interpretations or occult research, to disclose the secrets of the future. A particularly extravagant example, the extreme precision of which is evidence either of colossal impudence or extraordinary simplicity on the part of the seer, is identified with the name of Mr. F. L. Rawson, M.I.E.E., A.M.I.C.E. Mr. Rawson in the early part of this year acquired an unenviable notoriety owing to the exposure in the *Daily Mail*

of the exalted claims and the shrewd business methods of what the writer profanely called "Mr. Rawson's prayer-shop" at 90, Regent Street. As a result of their criticism the premises were raided by the police and a prosecution followed. With this, however, we have no concern. It need only be noted that in spite of the publicity thus attained and in spite of the fact that in July, 1905, Mr. Rawson was "dismissed from the membership of the Mother Church, the First Church of Christ Scientist, in Boston, Mass., because his teaching and practice were clearly shown to be contrary to the teachings of Christian Science,"¹ this gentleman, according to the printed programme, took a prominent part in the "National Congress of New Thought" held at London in the September of the present year. He was announced to conduct one "healing meeting," to act as chairman on another occasion, and to figure among the speakers who addressed the Congress on the opening day. Now in a bulky work, *Life Understood*, the second edition of which appeared at the close of 1914, Mr. Rawson quite definitely commits himself to the statement that the end of the world will come upon us in the December of this year 1917. To be precise, the great transformation will begin on Monday, December 3rd, and in the course of the next two or three days all will be over. But Mr. Rawson must be allowed to tell the story in his own words:

On December 3, 1917, as a result of the united action of the advanced mental workers throughout the world, a circular, carefully prepared by the leaders, is delivered as the Apocalypse shows, in every inhabited house in every civilized country. It also appears in every newspaper on that day . . . This circular, in a simple and concise way, sets out the facts of being, and gives the verified proofs thereof. It shows the glorious time that is at hand, and ends by calling upon every one to unite in turning in thought to God and realizing as clearly as possible that there is nothing but God; in other words, that there is no reality in matter, "all is infinite Mind and its infinite manifestation."

The denial of the reality of matter, and therefore of all evil, results in such a mental revolution that all true mental workers will that day heal practically everything instantaneously . . . In the afternoon and evening the coming to life of those who are ready for burial will be quite common.

¹ This is made known in an official letter addressed to the *Daily Mail*, Jan. 8, 1917, by a representative of the Christian Science body.

On Tuesday morning there will be hardly anything else in the papers but the details of the so-called miracles that have taken place on the Monday, particulars of which their staffs have collected. . . . On Tuesday such is the effect produced, that the raising of "the dead (so called) small and great" becomes universal. . . . Even the selfish materialist who has previously scoffed at any idea of an existing spiritual world around us . . . will manfully work his hardest in the hope that the good news may be true and that he may shortly be relieved of the living hell in which he has been existing during the previous six months.¹

If we ask how these conclusions have been arrived at, Mr. Rawson is quite ready to explain his methods. We have no intention of inflicting the details on our readers, though it may be noticed that one element in the calculation is provided by the death of Mrs. Eddy on Dec. 3, 1910, and another by the "seven days" mentioned in the fourth Book of Esdras (ch. vii. vv. 28—31)—both the Anglican and the Catholic Church, by the way, regard this book as apocryphal—hence we are told that "the seven years have started by the loosing of the devil on the death of Mrs. Eddy."² Other valuable data are provided by the measurements of the great Pyramid—the length of the grand gallery, for example, is exactly 1910 inches. Further, Luther's manifesto against Indulgences was published in 1517, and it is likewise extremely significant that Mrs. Eddy's immortal work, *Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures*, is copyrighted until 1917. Mr. Rawson is so dead certain of the accuracy of his computations that he is satisfied that his credit should stand or fall by them. Thus he says at the very close of his bulky volume:

My earliest important report was made for one of the leading financial houses in London over 35 years ago. It was on the first system of electric lighting commercially introduced into England. Out of the many investigations and reports I have since made on new discoveries and inventions of every kind, I know of no case where any one can put a finger on any mistake. I think, therefore, it will be agreed that considering the marvellous protection of God with which I have been surrounded, it is not likely that such a terrible mistake as to the date of the end could have been made in the greatest investigation of my life and the climax of my work.³

¹ *Life Understood*. 2nd. Edit., pp. 4A and 4B.

² *Ibid.* p. 110.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 637.

The extraordinary thing is that in his periodical *Active Service*, for Mr. Rawson is privileged to edit a "weekly paper" of his very own, he describes the issue of Sept. 8th in red lettering as the "HOW TO END THE WAR BY PRAYER" NUMBER, and contributes one long article on "How to bring about permanent peace," while another appears with the title "The Great War! when will it end?" But surely if the whole material world is to be annihilated on December 3rd, the question of a permanent peace may safely be left to take care of itself. By a curious irony Mr. Rawson's book *Life Understood*, from which all the details above given are taken, is conspicuously advertised on the cover of the same "How to end the War" number. It costs 15s. net in leather, and 21s. in morocco, and Mr. Rawson with characteristic modesty assures all whom it may concern that *Life Understood* is the standard work on mental healing.

H. T.

II. TOPICS OF THE MONTH

The President to the Pope.

The Papal Note of August 1st has not had the effect of making the belligerent nations fall upon each other's necks, but probably it has done a good deal of what His Holiness expected from it. The British, Russian and French replies have not yet been published; America alone of the Powers on our side has given its answer, and the only reply on the other side that matters has come from Germany. The contrast between the two is significant. President Wilson speaks, as he has a right to, for the American people alone, but it is improbable that the Notes of the Allies will be substantially different. It may even be that they will be content with his. He reiterates the American ideal which he has expressed so often and so eloquently before.

The object of this war [he says] is to deliver the free peoples of the world from the menace and the actual power of a vast military establishment controlled by an irresponsible Government which, having secretly planned to dominate the world, proceeded to carry out the plan without regard either to the sacred obligations of treaty or the long-established practices and long-cherished principles of international action and honour.

He longs for peace no less ardently than His Holiness does, but differs from the Pope in his reading of the facts. Germany is

a criminal power, and no peace can be made with an unrepentant criminal. The word of a treaty-breaker is not to be trusted. The teeth of the tiger must be drawn for the safety of mankind.

**The Kaiser's
Answer.**

The Kaiser on his side pens a reply which opens like a plea for canonization. To speak with moderation, it does not square with what we know of his character from his other acts and utterances. It is cynical in its disregard of veracity: it is disingenuous in its ignoring of some of the chief items in the Pope's proposals, the evacuation of France and Belgium, and so forth. But what makes it most remarkable is the homage it pays to the very antithesis of Prussian militarism—the rule of right in human affairs. Bernhardt and his evil philosophy are thrown overboard, at least on paper. That the War-Lord should have even written such words must seem incredible to the soldiers and professors who uphold quite another creed. Is this a case of "the devil a monk would be"? Or is the Kaiser really converted? The limiting clauses make us doubt. "Germany's vital interests," to be determined by Germany alone, still remain the ultimate criterion of right action. The whole letter forms an admirable justification of President Wilson's attitude. There is not the shadow even of recognition that Germany may have been mistaken, or that her methods are at all unseemly. We fear that as long as Germany is represented by such a spokesman peace with her could be neither honourable or lasting. It is all to the good that the Papal Note should have drawn out this document, which, while paying a reluctant homage to the Pope's ideals, shows at the same time so remote an intention to adopt them.

**Is War
discredited?**

It is all to the good, too, that the responsible Heads of States should be so emphatic in desiring to put an end to war. Before the Papal Note reached this country, Mr. Lloyd George at the Queen's Hall (Aug. 4th) pointed out what would be the effect of a premature and inconclusive peace. Germany wants peace now but not a permanent peace. The Prussians want time to prepare: they mean to utilize the lessons of the war and to make sure of their next attempt. "There must be no 'next time'," exclaimed the Prime Minister, "do not let us repeat this horror. Let us be the generation that manfully, courageously, resolutely eliminated war from among the tragedies of human life." We venture to think that these words will have a lasting echo amongst the peoples of every land, Germany included. The workers are determined to have no more war, for on them falls the heaviest burden and to them comes the least

advantage.¹ That seems to be the main determining cause of the association of the working-classes with revolutionary Socialism which is so marked a portent of our time. Socialism promises "a peoples' peace," the better, it is true, to prosecute its longed-for social war: and no more attractive bait could be offered to the war-weary multitudes. That the Kaiser too should in a State document repudiate war as a national policy and give his support to arbitration, viewing "with special sympathy" the leading idea of the Pope's appeal, viz., "that in the future the material power of arms must be superseded by the moral power of right," that the Austrian Emperor should still more emphatically endorse the same ideal might be considered to be a recantation of Prussianism by the Central Powers, were it not discounted by contemporaneous pronouncements by eminent Prussians. A high military official, General von Freytag-Loringhoven, has recently published a book called *Deductions from the World War*. What are his deductions? That war is a blunder, an anachronism, an unspeakable misfortune, an outrage on civilization? None of these things. This "Deputy Chief of the General Staff," after a detailed survey of the three years, considers that Germany must prepare for the next war by more efficient economic measures and by an immense increase in armaments, which before the war reached only "a feeble minimum measure of the desirable!"

**Militarism
and
Pessimism.**

It might seem that only a soulless Prussian could in the midst of this world carnage sit down and calculate how to go one better next time, and could contemplate saddling his beggared and starving country in the throes of economic ruin with the cost of stupendous military equipment. Such crude folly, could only, one would think, occur to a military automaton, with no higher ideal than animated his remote pagan ancestors. Yet similar ideas may be found at the back of the minds, and occasionally at the point of the pens, of several dechristianized writers amongst ourselves. We have from time to time noted their presence in Jingo papers: latterly, one of these arm-chair militarists has been admitted into the columns of the *New Witness* (Aug. 30), a journal which, whilst warring against corruption and shams and hypocrisies with great vigour and success, is often far too indiscriminate in its assaults and constantly roots up the wheat with the tares. In this case it permits its contributor to inveigh against Pacifism *tout court*, as though it were not a Christian virtue, albeit liable, like all other virtues, to be pursued

¹ "Of all the war-aims none is more important to the peoples of the world as that there should be henceforth on earth no more war." Statement of war-aims submitted by the Executive Committee of the Labour Party.

to excess or to have its name borrowed to cloak a vice. That it is not the heresy of Quakerism this writer has in mind may be seen from his sneering at Leagues of Peace and his admission—altogether unfounded—that we have had to Prussianize ourselves in order to combat Prussianism. He too, with the morbid pessimism of his type,¹ and its disbelief in human progress, contemplates “the next war,” some sixty years hence. We do not know which “intellectual” is the more to be dreaded, the Russian or Tolstoyan kind, or the superior Darwinian who believes in blind Fate and the inevitability of human conflict.

**The Pope
and a League
of Nations.**

Against such and all their ways we have now got the support of the Head of Christendom. Nothing is more consoling in the Papal Note than the Holy Father's deliberate advocacy of a simultaneous and reciprocal reduction of armaments,² and the substitution of universal courts of arbitration backed, be it noted, “by determinate sanctions against any State that should refuse either to submit international questions to arbitration or to accept its awards.” Here we have that League of Nations to uphold Right which the civilized world has long been sighing for. Both the “League to Enforce Peace” in America and the “League of Nations Society” in this country will be immensely strengthened by this suggestion of the Pope's. We trust that Catholics everywhere will realize its opportuneness and give it their adhesion. War could not be waged nor preparations for war made nor purposes of war entertained without the support of public opinion. If the public opinion of the Catholic world were definitely and finally ranged against war, except the punitive or police war which human perversity may always render necessary, how much more secure would be the peace of the world.³

¹ We have another in Dr. E. J. Dillon who, commenting on the above statement of the Labour Party, says, “The ultimate aim is declared to be the abolition of war, as though the Far East were not making ready, even now, for a future conflict *more ferocious and more fateful than the present struggle.*” *Fortnightly*, Sept. p. 345.

² Let us recall the words of his illustrious predecessor Pope Leo XIII. (Allocution, Feb. 11, 1889), “The menacing multiplication of armies is rather calculated to excite rivalry and suspicion than to repress them. It troubles men's minds by a restless expectation of coming disasters, it weighs down the citizens with expenses so heavy that one may doubt whether they are not even more intolerable than war itself.”

³ The project of a League of Free Nations was discussed in detail in the August MONTH. What was once and very lately considered as a dream of impractical visionaries has been brought by the war into the forefront of human needs, and it now has the support of the populace everywhere. There it was pointed out that the first and main weapon against a recalcitrant nation should be an economic boycott.

**Relief from
Armaments.**

We have all, whether victorious or vanquished, to face a future of diminished resources, enterprise and progress will be crippled on every hand owing to the demands made by our colossal war-debt. Hence the certainty of widespread unemployment with all the social disturbance and misery it brings. What a relief it will be if we have not to raise year by year that enormous sum of over a hundred millions which *before* the war was required for the maintenance of Army and Navy! Yet, unless this League is formed and becomes effective, it will not be the pre-war expenditure but something indefinitely greater that we shall have to face. Reasonably, then, does the Sovereign Pontiff suggest that, in lieu of heavy indemnities for war-damages which could in any case not be exacted in their fulness, and excepting certain cases where special reasons demand financial penalties, we should be prepared to accept this relief. What greater defeat of Prussianism can be imagined than disarmament! To continue our daily waste of material treasure solely with the aim that our foes should afterwards make it good, would be, emphatically, throwing good money after bad. But to go on sacrificing treasure which cannot be replaced, those thousands of young and gallant lives that appear in our daily Roll of Honour,—to continue such carnage solely for economic reasons is, the Pope rightly says, unthinkable. The more closely the Papal document is studied the less justifiable will be seen to be the hasty journalistic condemnation it received in this country. Journalists have barely time to read, much less to study, but that does not excuse the reflections upon the Holy Father's motives and inspiration which many of the Entente journals thought fit to pass.

**The Pope
and Freedom of
the Seas.**

Even the reference to "the true freedom and common enjoyment of the seas" (not merely of the *high* seas, as the German reply, with a view to the Baltic and the Euxine, misinterprets it) to which the greatest exception was taken really bears no sinister interpretation. The Pope meant, as has been authoritatively stated (Aug. 24th) by Cardinal Gasparri, nothing more than President Wilson meant in his speech to the Senate, January, 1917, taken with the gloss afforded by his present action.

I am proposing [he said] government by consent of the governed: that freedom of the seas which, in international conference after conference, representatives of the United States have urged with the eloquence of those who are the convinced disciples of liberty.

What was then in the President's mind speaking as a neutral was probably the tangled question of contraband over which there were frequent bickerings at the beginning of the war. What the

President as a belligerent now thinks of such questions is shown by the severity with which he is "rationing" neutral trade, a severity which goes far beyond what was previously attempted.

The salient facts are that the seas *are* free (though *ports* are not) to everyone during time of peace, and that during war-time they are impeded, according to the needs and abilities of belligerents, just as land communications are. What Germany hopes for by "freedom of the seas" has been declared by a Pan-German in *Das Grossere Deutschland* to be, frankly, "domination over the world sea." "I deliberately use the expression 'domination';" says this engaging Teuton, "and not the expression 'freedom of the seas';" because the latter is "either dishonest or stupid." This we may assume is not the Pope's meaning, nor is any other which is not consistent with justice and common sense.

No "War
after
the War."

There is one point in which President Wilson enlarges and elaborates what is merely latent in the Pope's appeal: a point about which newspaper comments on the American Note have been mostly silent. The President says:

No peace can rest securely upon political or economic restrictions meant to benefit some nations and cripple or embarrass others, upon vindictive action of any sort, or any kind of revenge or deliberate injury. . . . Punitive damages, the dismemberment of empires, the establishment of selfish and exclusive economic leagues, we deem inexpedient and in the end worse than futile, no proper basis for a peace of any kind, least of all for an enduring peace. That must be based upon justice and fairness and the common rights of mankind.

Herein the President is acting upon his well-known and, as we think, well-founded distinction between the German Government and the German people. If it were urged that the German people approve of the most unjust designs and the worst atrocities of their rulers, he would answer they do not know enough to see the truth: selfish and lawless ambitions seem to them the desperate defence of a beloved country against a world of foes; atrocities the inevitably barbarous side of war, or, at the worst, reprisals against similar outrages on the part of the Allies. To go on punishing for the crimes of their Government by any form of economic boycott a whole misguided population, more sinned against than sinning, might well seem to the President not only "inexpedient" but really unjust. But inexpedient it certainly is, not only because it would prevent the establishment of a durable peace by perpetuating one of the main causes of war, but because it must necessarily prolong the present war by welding the German Government and people indissolubly together. The Allies say to the German people—"if you stick to

your Government you will be involved in its punishment." The German Government says to its subjects—"if you do not support us you will be economically ruined." Nothing could be better calculated to stiffen German resistance than that threat of an economic boycott, perpetual exclusion from certain trades or certain countries, hostile discriminating tariffs, refusal of raw materials and the rest of the dismal prospect held forth by unthinking or rapacious foes to a strong and stubborn people, who, after all, must live, and who in the interest of the whole world should thrive, after the war. Lord Hugh Cecil has authoritatively declared that the resolutions of the Paris Conference were "purely defensive measures and in no way aggressive."¹ No one can complain that the Allies should take measures to protect themselves against that "peaceful penetration" which, as practised by Germany, was a serious menace to their economic and military strength. But it is one thing to safeguard one's own essential industries, and to seek to regain economic health after the drain of the war, and quite another to bar out Germany from her legitimate share of material goods by an international boycott. America will have no part in such a policy, and that alone would render it as futile as vexatious.

French and English in Canada. Apropos of our remarks in the August issue concerning the dangers ahead in Canada, we have received from more than one quarter in the Dominion letters more forcible than polite, controverting our estimate of the state of affairs there and generally accusing the French element of the population of being hypersensitive, unreasonable, aggressive and unfair to the English-speaking section. Nothing was farther from our purpose than to misrepresent anything or anyone or, contrary to the directions sent to Canada by Pope Benedict, to accentuate the unhappy racial strife which threatens to disrupt Our Lady of the Snows. But our views, though necessarily founded on second-hand information, were confirmed from such various and trustworthy sources, both oral and written, that in default of any accessible exposition of the other side it seemed safe to express them. That valuable fortnightly, for instance, *The Catholic Mind*, published by the America Press, in its issue for June 22nd, expounds in greater detail and with much more emphasis than did THE MONTH the linguistic grievances of French Catholics in Ontario. As long as that powerful document remained unanswered, it might fairly be concluded that there was no answer to make. We can understand bilingualism being regarded as a nuisance by people of English descent, yet so long as the rights of the French are guaranteed under the original Federation Act, they cannot be blamed for insisting on them. However, far be it from us,

¹ Interview on Aug. 31st, reported in *The Times*, Sept. 3rd.

ill-equipped as our critics hold us to be, to interfere authoritatively in a domestic controversy. We can only pray that it may be settled in the spirit urged by the Ontario hierarchy in their collective letter of January 30th, without violation either of justice or charity.

**The Papacy
and
Catholic Unity.**

In August we had occasion to traverse some historical views of a certain *Church Times* writer called "Cismarine" regarding the Schism which gave birth to the Anglican Church. In a more recent issue¹ he attempts a yet bolder enterprise, and tries to turn the tables on the Papists by asserting that the Papacy, which, according to their theory, was intended to be the centre and support of unity, has *de facto* proved to be a fruitful source of schism. Hence, as it has not done what it was meant to do, it cannot be what it claims to be. "By its fruits ye shall know it." The arrogant pretensions of the Papacy, so runs the argument, to universal jurisdiction have proved intolerable to large portions of the flock. The Greeks have revolted; so have the Anglicans. A sovereignty which has not proved a bond of union cannot have been intended by God.

This is a good example of the incredibly shallow sophistry to which the Anglican mind is forced by its refusal to give their true value to obvious facts. We might parallel the argument thus. The revelation of Christianity was presumably intended by God to save and sanctify the world: the world, even the Christian world, is in great measure unregenerate and unsanctified: therefore after all Christianity, since it has not done so, was *not* meant to sanctify the world. "Cismarine" forgets or ignores the fact that the unity of Catholicism is a moral unity, a consensus of free wills in the acceptance of a revealed plan of salvation. The infallible Papacy provides the only rational rallying-point for this voluntary adhesion, but, as free will cannot be coerced, many exercise their freedom in refusing it. The Pope, like the Saviour whose earthly Vicar he is, is set for the ruin as well as for the resurrection of many in Israel. Many found Christ's sayings "hard" and left Him, became schismatics. The Papal sovereignty is the cause of schism only in the sense in which the law is the cause of sin. It makes formal and conscious what might otherwise be committed ignorantly and inculpably. The flock is always one, because those who leave the fold no longer belong to the flock.

**American Catholics
and
The War.**

A notable feature of America's joining in the war against Germany is the whole-hearted way in which the Catholics of the United States have responded to their country's call. Unlike the Socialists the Catholic Church has led the way in inculcating patriotism and self-sacrifice in the cause of public duty.

¹ *Church Times*, Sept. 14th, p. 216.

It is said that the proportion of Catholics enlisted greatly exceeds their proportion of the population. They are twenty per cent of the population yet they form at least one-third of the enlisted men. Corresponding to this noble response of the soldiers have been the efforts of those who cannot so serve to help in the campaign. The War Department has selected the Knights of Columbus to perform for Catholics in camp the work which the Y.M.C.A. does so admirably amongst us. That great Catholic Order has already raised a fund of a million dollars for this purpose, and is well on the way to secure a second million. This fund will be used in providing the sixteen great cantonments, wherein America's Army is being trained, with chapels and recreation huts, and also for the expenses of auxiliary chaplains. Regarding the supply of regular chaplains, the War Department has made every effort to obtain an adequate number, and in general to secure the moral welfare of the troops. According to our contemporary *America* (Sept. 1st):

The United States Government stands unique to-day amongst all the Governments in maintaining that absolute continency is to be the moral code of its army, and wherever American troops are found, the Government means that womanhood, the womanhood both of allies and enemies, shall be revered and protected.

In addition to all this the American Cardinals summoned a Catholic War Conference on August 11th and 12th at Washington to consider all the problems raised for Catholics by the war, and to secure unity of action and aim. As a result a national organization has been projected, acting through the Ordinaries of every diocese, to co-ordinate the war-work of all the Catholic Societies throughout the country. We have something to learn from the business-like energy of our brethren in the States.

**The Extension
of
Divorce.**

A deplorable campaign will be inaugurated in this country early in October to extend the already disastrous facilities for divorce which exist in this country. It is set on foot by the Divorce Law Reform Union, a body which has definitely broken with Christian teaching on this most important subject, and it must be counteracted by all who have the welfare of society at heart. Occasion has been taken of the needs created by the war, especially the loss of young life, to advocate this, amongst other poisonous fads, that separations of three years and upwards should be converted by law at a nominal cost into divorces. Thus, it is claimed, "freedom would be given to the million permanently-separated persons in this country." No evidence of this claim is given, but even were it true it is no argument for undermining the stability of human society. The value of the doctrine of the indissolubility of consummated Christian mar-

riage, as the chief safeguard of the family and therefore of the basis of the social organism, is all the more clearly shown by the hardships and inconveniences that are incurred in upholding it. We may freely own that there are many ill-assorted marriages, the dissolution of which would relieve individuals from much misery. That is true of other contracts besides the matrimonial. But we know what becomes of international society when inconvenient agreements are treated like scraps of paper, and if this most sacred of human contracts, raised by Christ to the status of a sacrament and involving the welfare of many others besides the contracting parties, is to be freely torn up with the approval of the law, then God help society! The Catholic attitude needs no explanation or emphasis. We trust that those of our Anglican friends who still take our Lord as legislator may exert themselves to get free from the anomalous position into which they were led by the miserable betrayal of their Bishops in 1857.

Intolerance.

An interesting cinema-spectacle, which is being at present exhibited in London, is styled "Intolerance," but the fitness of the title is not very obvious. The designers of the drama have made no attempt to distinguish between that unjustifiable intolerance, which in matters of religion we call bigotry, and the necessary intolerance, which in a world under the dominion of the moral law truth must show towards error and virtue towards vice. We keep these terms in the abstract, because in practice there are needed so many arrests of judgment, because of the weakness and ignorance and general irresponsibility of the sinner, that *a priori* condemnations are often unfair and unkind. No one is more gentle towards sinners, no one more implacable towards sin, than the Christian Saint. But to stigmatize intolerance as always and everywhere wrong and unjust—such is the impression conveyed by the hazy morality of the film in question—is itself utterly wrong. The State, in its present imminent peril, is rightly and sternly intolerant towards those of its citizens who refuse it any sort of service,—the "conscientious objectors" who so degrade the noble faculty of conscience. Every corporate body must be intolerant of everything that assails its corporate life.

But the secular State, which includes members of different beliefs, must be tolerant towards all of them that are not subversive of civil society. Hence the resentment of British Catholics when the Anglican Bishop of Birmingham styled them lately "the guests of the nation." Hence the astonishing impudence of Mr. Leo Maxse's¹ insinuation that we should be grateful "for the extraordinary tolerance which Catholicism has enjoyed under British rule." Gratitude is due for the concession of favours, not for the concession of rights.

THE EDITOR.

¹ *National Review*, Sept. 27.

III. NOTES ON THE PRESS

[A summary survey of current periodicals with a view to recording useful articles which 1) expound Catholic doctrine and practice, 2) expose heresy and bigotry, and 3) are of general Catholic interest.]

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE.

Esculapius, The Pretended Miracles of [E. Mangelot in *Revue du Clergé Français*, August 15, Sept. 1 and 15, 1917].

Gambling, The Ethics of [E. Masterson, S.J., in *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, Sept. 1917, p. 177].

"Parousia," The [Cardinal Billot in *Etudes*, July 20, Sept. 20, 1917].

Sacred Heart: Discussion of the Twelfth Promise [B. L. Conway, C.S.P., in *Catholic World*, Sept. 1917, p. 794].

CATHOLIC DEFENCE.

Anglicans and Inspiration: The Decree of Convocation on the Scriptures [A. H. Atteridge in *America*, August 25, 1917, p. 494].

Anglicanism at the Front, Failure of [E. L. Millard in *America*, Sept. 8, 1917, p. 543].

Atheism, The Shallowness of [Prof. A. Rahilly in *Studies*, Sept. 1917, p. 424].

Darwinism, Decay of [R. Multkowski in *America*, Sept. 8, 1917, p. 541].

French Clergy in the War, Defence of [Jean Guiraud in "Clergé et Congrégations au service de la France," see *Etudes*, Sept. 20, 1917, p. 794].

French War-Orphans, Violation of their religious rights by the State [*America*, Sept. 8, 1917, pp. 539, 553].

"New Thought" Movement [H. Thurston, S.J., in *Month*, Oct. 1917, p. 324].

Science, Advance of, due to Believers [A. Eymieu in *Revue Pratique d'Apologétique*, August 15, Sept. 15, 1917].

Socialism, International: a traitorous organization [J. Keating, S.J., in *Month*, Oct. 1917, p. 336].

Temporal Power, Pius IX. and the [Mgr. D. Hallinan in *Catholic Bulletin*, Sept. 1917, p. 567].

POINTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST.

Canada, Religious and Political issues in [*Tablet*, Sept. 22, 1917, p. 362].

Catholic Education the right of Catholic Children [P. L. Blakely, S.J., in *America*, Sept. 1, 1917, p. 533].

Education: Mr. Fisher's Bill [S. F. Smith S.J., in *Month*, Oct. 1917, p. 289].

France: The Question of Repopulation [L. Désers in *Revue du Clergé Français*, Sept. 1, 1917, p. 385].

Intemperance, How to counteract [F. Gibon in *Revue Pratique d'Apologétique*, Sept. 15, 1917].

Russian Church, Erastian Constitution of [*Tablet*, Sept. 1917, p. 261]. Proposed reorganization of [A. Palmieri, O.S.A., in *Catholic World*, Sept. 1917, p. 786].

Temperance: Arguments against State Purchase [P. Coffey in *Studies*, Sept. 1917, p. 353]. Arguments for [Dean of Lincoln in *The Commonwealth*, Sept. 1917, p. 271].

REVIEWS

I—THE NEW CODE OF CHURCH LAW¹

IT was in March, 1904, not many months after his accession, that Pius X., with the enterprise and determination that was in him, decided to take up and carry to a satisfactory completion the scheme for codifying the Canon Law which had been felt to be needful by generations of ecclesiastical lawyers, and had been especially urged on the Vatican Council by many of its episcopal members. What had delayed its accomplishment till so long after the closing of that Council was the extreme complexity of the subject, which it required a Pontiff of Pius X.'s energy to face, but, though he did not himself live to see his work completed, it was due to him that it was persisted in, and accordingly our present Pontiff, in his Bull of Promulgation of the new Code, is careful to describe it as "*Pii X. Pontificis maximi jussu digestus et Benedicti Papæ XV. auctoritate promulgatus.*" The Bull of Promulgation which is thus described by Benedict XV. and will be known henceforth by its initial words, *Providentissima mater*, was published on Whit-Sunday of the present year, and is prefixed to the text of the new *Corpus Juris canonici* in Vol. II. pars, II. n. 9. of the *Acta Apostolicæ Sedis*, thereby initiating a method of publication which is henceforth to be the ordinary method by which Papal legislation is to be promulgated.

The character of the new body of Church Law will be minutely scrutinized and discussed in the coming months by those whose studies of the canon law qualify them to throw light on the significance of its provisions. The purpose of the present notice is the more modest one of giving our own readers a general idea of the relation in which the new code will henceforth stand to the legislation of the past, and of the innovations that it will introduce into the law of the Church.

Legislation in every social body which as such is controlled by a governing authority, and especially in those social

¹ *Acta Apostolicæ Sedis. Codex Juris Canonici . . . Benedicti Papæ XV. auctoritate promulgatus. Romæ ex typis Vaticanis, 1917. Pretium, lire 12.*

organisms which are called perfect as being in their own order supreme, is necessarily continuous. At most there can be fundamental laws laid down at some time in the past that they may be the basis on which all subsequent legislation is to rest. These for civil States are called constitutions, but for the Church their place is taken by the prescriptions which our Lord laid down for it when He instituted it during His earthly life. The subsequent laws built on this foundation must needs be multitudinous and progressive, to adapt themselves to the changes required in proportion as the people governed passes through new phases of its life and develops new exigencies under the pressure of the new situations. An inevitable consequence of this is that the historical course of legislation cannot run in scientific grooves, but is essentially occasional, and the result is that in social bodies that have lasted through long centuries the number of the laws multiplies excessively, and comes to form an unwieldy mass of legal material, much of which is inconsistent or even contradictory, much too has become obsolete through long disuse. In face of the confusion thus engendered many even of the higher authorities, whose office it is to administer the laws in one department or another, are often at a loss to understand what it is save by hazardous reliance on expert lawyers, who in turn manifest their own incertitude by their frequent differences of opinion, which not rarely divide them into rival schools.

The way out of this maze is by what is called codifying the law, that is, reducing its provisions to an orderly system under the control of some scientific principle. This can be and has been at times done by private collectors, at other times by the supreme authority in the State or the Church. The advantage of the latter of these two methods is however that the ruler has the power to simplify the new code by imparting authority to the laws as they stand in its pages, and repealing whatever of previous legislation is inconsistent with them, whereas a private collector can at best point out where there is any difference or inconsistency between law and law, he can introduce no alteration of his own, and an essential consequence of this is that his work cannot be simple and brief like that of an authoritative collector.

There have been new codes of civil law in comparatively recent times, the best known of which is the Code Napoleon,

so called because promulgated under the First French Empire, but in reality the work of several previous generations. In the Catholic Church what till now has been called the *Corpus Juris* was indeed a Code, consisting partly of three collections by Papal authority, and partly of others by private canonists, but all arranged in scientific order. This Code, however, did not extend to legislation later than the thirteenth century, or a little way into the fourteenth. But codification needs to be brought up to date and hence renewed at intervals, yet there has been no fresh Code of Church Law till now.

It must be remembered too that to codify the law of the Catholic Church was a far more difficult operation than to codify that of a civil State, inasmuch as the Church legislation runs much further back than does that of any civil State, and besides has to take into account the needs not merely of the people of one country but those of all countries. All the more wonderful is it therefore that the new Church Code should have been completed within thirteen years from the time when it was first taken in hand by Pius X. We must, however, remember that the task had been lightened for those engaged in it by the treatises of so many canonists in recent years who had investigated the Canon Law, ancient and modern, from every side.

Now that we have the new Code in our hands it is a surprise and delight to find that all has been reduced to so short a compass. A small quarto volume of 510 pages suffices to contain it all. The Canons moreover are comprised within 456 pages and are numbered from 1 to 2414, so that they can be cited by this simple reference "Canon 350," or "633," or whatever it happens to be—a pleasant contrast to the complicated method of citing the documents in the old *Corpus Juris*. In eight Appendices at the end of the volume certain Papal decrees are given, in whole or in the operative parts, on account of their importance. Of these the first three are the Bulls of Leo XIII. and Pius X. relating to the conditions under which Papal Elections are to be held; two are Bulls of Benedict XIV., one on the parochial system and the other, the famous *Sacramentum Pœnitentiæ*, which guards from abuse the administration of the Sacrament of Penance; and three more by earlier Popes are on the application of what is called the *Privilegium Paulinum* to converts from paganism.

It may seem that the publication of a Code so easy to

understand must free us in the future from the necessity of seeking the aid of the canonists. So it will, no doubt, to a large extent, but not altogether. The art of interpreting the Canons is one that will always require expert guidance, and where the new Code has incorporated laws which were first enacted in far past times and have had their history, the work of interpretation will necessitate examining those phases of past history which only an expert can follow correctly.

These few words will be sufficient to explain the nature of the change in the structure of the Canon Law which has been thus introduced. It would be beyond the scope of this notice to remark upon the modifications of the law itself which have resulted except to point out that the object of the codification has been to retain what is substantive in the law of the past, but to arrange it in a simpler and better order, so that any novelties that are to be found in the new text are incidental only. There are, however, a considerable number of such modifications of the previous law which will take effect when the new Code comes into force, as it will on Whit-Sunday next year. Of these it may interest the lay reader to know that one of these incidental changes is that it will no longer be unlawful on days of abstinence for those who are dispensed from the abstinence to eat fish and meat at the same meal; also that one or two matrimonial impediments are removed as no longer helpful, for instance, that of *disparitas cultus*, which creates a diriment impediment between a baptized and an unbaptized person, though retained as far as Catholics are concerned; that perpetual vows can no longer be taken in a religious Order or Congregation until after yearly vows have first been taken for at least three successive years: and that manifestation of conscience to a religious superior can no longer be exacted in any Order at all, or even encouraged save in Orders where the Superiors are not priests.

2—MEDIEVAL HISTORY¹

WHILE we cannot recommend this volume as a manual for Church History, it may well enough be praised for ordinary examination purposes. Brightly written, and with an eye to the picturesque, its interest is well maintained

¹ *Outlines of Medieval History.* By C. W. Previté Orton, M.A. Cambridge: University Press. Pp. x, 585, with maps. Price, 10s. 6d. 1916.

throughout its vast field. It is also full of well-marshalled facts, such as a teacher would like to have under his hand, and a student will readily assimilate: the technical terms too are modern, such as examiners are sure to understand. Mr. Orton moreover loves his subject, and knows how to excuse and explain the faults of an age, as for instance the violence of the Middle Ages. He can also admire the ideals of the monk, the zeal of the missionary, the high aims and civilizing power of the Church, the discipline enforced by the Popes. He neither calumniates, grudges nor controverts religious tenets different from his own.

Nevertheless, his standpoint is frankly not Catholic; and in the endless conflicts between Church and State, between local churches and the Roman Patriarch, he uses almost always a terminology which is theologically untenable. Take for instance the story of Charlemagne where we find (p. 141) a whole pocketful of erroneous propositions; these, however, with the aid of a Catholic text-book, may be corrected without serious difficulty. The errors are not new, indeed they are just what we might have expected—anti-Papal, anti-dogmatic, adverse to progress in law and doctrine. There is a large reservation to be made, therefore, in commending this volume; but that must not make us obscure the obviously good intentions of the author and the general utility of his work.

3—THE PHYSICAL WELFARE OF MOTHERS AND CHILDREN¹

FOR some few decades past social reformers have been watching with anxiety, not free from consternation, the appalling falling off of our population, not happily so far in its absolute numbers, though that might come in this country as it has in others if things were allowed to go on as they have been allowed to go on in the past, but in the birth-rate which has long been a commonly observed fact and is strikingly illustrated by the statistics given in Vol. I. of these Reports in regard to the birth-rates of seventeen of our large towns. Of late years preventive and remedial measures have

¹ *Report on the Physical Welfare of Mothers and Children. England and Wales.* Two Volumes. Pp. xvi, 434; viii, 190. 1917. The Carnegie United Kingdom Trust.

been gradually provided so far forth as public opinion could be got to realize the danger and supply the needful funds. But since the war broke out and the demands on our population for the supply of our armies have become so sweeping, a wider and fuller interest in the movement for stemming the evil has developed, which forebodes that at all events when the war is over and indeed, so far as possible, even before then, more effective steps will be taken. "The value of population," says Dr. Hope, "has never been appreciated as it is to-day, and regrets at the unheeded wastage of infant life in bygone years are as sincere as they are useless. A simple calculation shows that, had the annual wastage of infant life during the last 50 years been no greater than it is at present, at least 500,000 more men would have been available for the defence of the country."

The Carnegie United Kingdom Trustees are rendering a signal service to the country by the interest they are taking in this important subject, and especially by the investigations they have been conducting with a view to ascertaining and placing within the reach of social students the facts of the present situation and the effects so far of the remedial measures that have been taken during the last quarter of a century in the three kingdoms. What we have before us at present for review are the two volumes published this year, which contain the statistics for England and Wales, and the Reports in reference to them by those appointed by the Trustees to give them. Of these the first and largest is by Dr. E. W. Hope, the Medical Officer of Health for Liverpool, which contains the General Report, Charts, and Diagrams, an Abstract of the legislation at present in force, and Epitomes of the Local Reports of the authorities concerned. The second volume contains the Report by Dr. Janet Campbell, one of the Senior Medical Officers of the Board of Education, on Midwives and their practice, and the work accomplished for infant welfare by voluntary effort. As regards this latter we get a store of valuable information on what is being done and what still remains to be done for the training of midwives, for the establishment of Schools for Mothers where they can be advised and trained in the care and management of their infants, a matter in regard to which at present so many of them through no fault of their own are gravely and dangerously ignorant; also about Maternity Homes, Day Nurseries,

Nursery Schools, Play Centres, Housing Conditions, and cognate matters, with lists showing the provision already made, largely by voluntary effort, which in England is wont to take the initiative and carry on work of social necessity till they reach a stage of development when, if they are to be continued and expanded, the State must come in to aid or take them over.

Three-quarters of the first volume are taken up with epitomes of the Returns of the Medical Officers of Health for the several localities of the Kingdom, Metropolitan, Urban, and Rural. These of course supply the statistics on which all the inferences in the Report of Dr. Hope are based. They must be studied carefully by readers interested, as certainly all priests should be, as well as our own social workers who gather round their clergy and co-operate with them in this particular branch of ministration. But we must confine ourselves here to calling attention to one or two of the important points which are emphasized by Dr. Hope and others.

Dr. Arthur Newsholme, the Medical Officer to the Local Government Board, in his short prefatory Note tells us that to his mind the chief burden of the Reports is the immediate need for further national effort to reduce sickness and mortality among child-bearing mothers, and the closely related mortality among infants before birth and in the first month after live-birth." On the average in England and Wales there occur week by week 67 deaths of mothers as the result of pregnancy and parturition, of which 24 are due to puerperal infections. That this cause of mortality is preventible to a large extent is proved by the reduction in the national mortality during recent years, which is in proportion to the means that have been taken to control it, the rural parts faring worse in this respect than the town districts, and some town districts worse than in others; a difference clearly due to the fuller provision for coping with the evil which characterizes the towns as distinguished from the rural districts and some towns as distinguished from others. A very noticeable feature to which the statistics bear regular witness is that a high birth-rate goes regularly along with a high infant mortality rate. Why this is does not appear to be clearly understood, as far as we can gather from these Reports; but it would be unsound to deduce from this curious fact that the increase of the population is better served by a

low birth-rate than by a higher one, since it is equally clear from the statistics that the higher birth-rate invariably determines ultimately the increase of the population, the saving by precaution or remedial measures of infants born reaching a proportionately smaller number than the increment due to the higher birth-rate.

Besides these two volumes which have been sent to us, two others, one on Scotland, one on Ireland, are referred to in the Preface as either already published or, as we imagine is the case, yet to come. May the study of these sad but interesting facts inspire many generous souls to aid in this work for the saving of our new generation and their parents. There is plenty of good will and earnest desire among our well-to-do and educated people. Only they need to have the facts which call for their solicitude made known to them.

4.—THE VENERABLE TONGUE OF ENGLAND¹

MALTA, as we all know, was at one time a possession of the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, namely from 1530, when, the Knights having been turned out of Rhodes by the Turks, the Island of Malta was given over to them by the Emperor Charles V. in his capacity of King of Spain—that they might be able the better to continue their mission of protecting the Christians from the Turks, who were now infesting the Mediterranean and frequently carrying off into captivity the peaceful traders or travellers whose ships they had captured with their war galleys. The Knights remained in possession of the island till the end of the eighteenth century, when it came into the possession first of the French under Napoleon, then of the British, who captured it from the French in 1800, and have kept it ever since as a fortress and harbour for the protection of their fleet in the Mediterranean. The Grand Masters who held their court there and governed the island for nearly three hundred years vacated it when it fell into the hands of Napoleon, and from that time, as the power of the Turks was now crushed and the peculiar mission of the Knights for the protection of Christian travellers had in consequence lost its *raison d'être*, the Knights have been reduced to a shadow of their former selves. The traces, however, of

¹ *Knights Hospitallers of the Venerable Tongue of England*. By Canon Mgr. Mifsud, D.D., Kt.J.J., *The Malta Herald*. 1916.

their former existence at Malta are still visible there, particularly at Valetta, where are the remarkable buildings they erected for the palace of the Grand Master and the Auberges, as they were called, of the different Tongues, that is, nationalities, which in former days contributed members to the Order; and took each of them on itself to provide hospitality for those of their own tongue who might happen to visit the island—a good custom they had inherited from the former generations of their Order who were wont to give it in Palestine to the pilgrims on visit to the Holy Places.

Mgr. Mifsud, himself a chaplain of the Order, seems to have read a paper before the Malta Historical Society a few years ago, on the documents in the archives of the island bearing on the Knights of the Venerable Tongue of England of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem. Some friends suggested to him to expand and publish the contents of this paper, in the feeling that a section of English people would be interested in these historical details concerning the part their own countrymen had played in the life of this famous Order. Hence the present volume, which seems to have been prepared and printed some years back but has only recently been sent to us. It cannot be said that the editing is satisfactory, though readers will make allowance for the defects of a book published in English at Valetta. But it does contain a number of interesting facts about English members of the Order, their Auberge at Valetta, and the fate of their province or Tongue, which owing to the loss of interest in it when the country became Protestant, was transmuted into an Anglo-Bavarian Tongue in the eighteenth century, and later still, into a Russian Tongue.

5—THE APOLOGETICUS OF TERTULLIAN¹

THIS book contains the text of Tertullian's *Apologeticus*, with an excellent English translation, but the *raison d'être* of its publication is that it contains the notes upon the *Apologeticus* which the late Professor John E. Mayor, of Cambridge, accumulated during the years 1893 to 1907. They were written down on sheets interleaved in a volume of

¹ *Q. Septimi Florentis Tertulliani Apologeticus*. The text annotated by Professor John E. Mayor, M.A. With a translation by Professor Alexander Souter, B.A. Cambridge, at the University Press. Pp. xx, 496. Price, 12s. 6d. 1917.

Professor Oehler's edition of Tertullian, apparently with the intention that they might serve as material for a course of lectures on the *Apologeticus*, such as Professor Mayor delivered before the University of Cambridge some years ago, and perhaps also for a commentary on the same subject which he hoped some day to be able to write. They are described by Professor Mayor himself as meant not for a complete commentary, such being already sufficiently supplied by writers like Professor Oehler, but as supplementary to those works. And this may explain their limited scope, for they consist almost exclusively of illustrative passages from the writings either of Tertullian himself or of other early patristic or even of classical authors. Still they are really valuable Notes, and were well fitted to form a volume by themselves. Indeed Professor Mayor himself began to publish them in successive portions in the *Journal of Theology* in 1893. For some unknown reason, however, he discontinued their publication there after he had reached the end of the fifth chapter, and nothing more was done in that way during his lifetime, which ended in 1910. After his death his executors, feeling it undesirable that such valuable matter should be lost, invited Mr. Alexander Souter, the Regius Professor of Humanities at St. Andrew's, to undertake the work of editing, and he, being an old pupil of Professor John Mayor at Cambridge, who had himself heard the lectures on the *Apologeticus* when they were delivered and recognized that they had exercised an influence on his own formation, accepted the task in the feeling that by discharging it he was fulfilling a duty of *pietas* toward his old Professor. All will feel that he has done his work exceedingly well, and has provided students of Tertullian with an aid which will be of much assistance to them. He is himself responsible for the English translation, for which he pleads modestly that it has been revised by the veteran Professor Joseph Mayor, late of King's College, London. For supplying too, this English translation he apologizes on the ground that Tertullian is the most difficult of all Latin prose writers, and no doubt this fact will make it acceptable even to those who will feel the need of carefully comparing it with the Latin original.

The introduction and, we imagine, though that is not explicitly stated, the first five chapters of the Notes, are from the pages of the *Journal of Theology*, that is to say, are from Pro-

fessor Mayor's own hand. We may take then from this Introduction words which show the veteran student's own appreciation of Tertullian as an author both in respect of his literary style and of his Latinity. The words indeed are those of the late Professor A. W. Evans, who wrote as far back as 1859. But they are accepted and cited by Professor Mayor with such unqualified approval that we may regard them as expressing his own conviction.

Tertullian not only surpassed his predecessors in information and talent, but was peculiarly fitted by temper to treat of such a subject as that of the *Apologeticus*. No one could express in such forcible language the indignant sense of injustice or represent its detail in a more lively manner. None could press his arguments so closely, and few had so learned an acquaintance with heathenism, and could expose its follies with more bitter sarcasm or whip its wickedness with a heavier lash. . . . It will not be too much to say that it is the noblest oration among all which antiquity has left us. Its brilliant pictures are glowing before our eyes, its deep tone of declamation is sounding in our ears, its imploring, its condemning, its expostulating accents have touched our feelings to the quick. . . . What literary gee-gaws do the finest orations of Cicero and Demosthenes appear after this! How do we not put them away as childish things, and feel ashamed that we should set such value on the vituperative filth which is poured forth upon Aeschines and Antony, political rivals on the narrow stage of a corner of this little world.

And as to Tertullian's Latinity, Professor Mayor shows himself to be not one of those whose reading is confined to the handful of writers barely filling a single shelf, which are counted as Latin classics.

"He would venture to offer a few reasons for following Scaliger, Casaubon, Gataker, Bentley, Wasse, Haupt, and Bernays in widening their ken to the entire range of Latin authors of whatever creed or profession down to the contemporaries of Bede and Alcuin. When a Greek or Roman philosopher or rhetorician became a Christian he did not at once forget all the learning of the past. A very large part of what we know of ancient religion, a very large number of perfectly classical words, have been preserved to us only by the Fathers."

One thing we cannot but desiderate in this inviting edition. We could have wished that either Professor Mayor himself, or Professor Souter had furnished the reader with a concise synopsis of the argument of the *Apologeticus*.

6—LUTHER¹

WITH its sixth volume, which comes to hand just as the fourth centenary of Luther's break with the Catholic Church is upon us, this English translation of Father Grisar's fine study of the heresiarch reaches its completion. The praise it has received from critics on every side is a testimony that it has been recognized as a standard work, and it is safe to say that henceforth it will count as an indispensable repertory of facts and estimates, to which those must have recourse who would judge of this remarkable personality with adequate knowledge. In one respect Father Grisar's mode of treatment is open to criticism. It is essentially of the kind which leaves the reader in the position of being unable to see the trees for the wood. One reads through page after page of these six full volumes in which facts or allegations often at variance with one another are crowded together, and if at times one is disposed to frame a definite judgment on some point or other in Luther's character or actions, one is presently brought face to face with another series of incidents or utterances which the author seems to take as constraining to a quite opposite judgment. This is due, no doubt, to the author's solicitude to be absolutely impartial in his estimate of Luther, and to attach due weight to all that can be said in his favour as well as against him; and in a biographical study which is so intensely controversial and controverted, it is of immense importance that a Catholic writer of Father Grisar's standing, as an historian as well as a theologian, should have adopted this course. If the outcome is that the reader has to form his own estimate of the detailed features of the heresiarch's character, at least it provides him with a wealth of authenticated facts on which to base that estimate, and at least it settles beyond dispute that Luther was full of inconsistencies, was one of the most turbulent of men, a terrible instrument of social as well as of religious destructiveness, and without any capacity at all for constructive work.

The new volume commences with a chapter on Luther's endeavours, but utter failure, to improve the educational institutions of his country, or to minister to the relief of the poor. "Wherever Lutheranism prevails," said Erasmus, "we

¹ By Hartmann Grisar, S.J. Authorized translation by E. M. Lamond Edited by Luigi Cappadelta. Vol. VI. Pp. viii, 551. Price, 12s. net. 1917.

see the downfall of learning." "We may say briefly," writes Adolf Harnack, "that, alas! nothing of importance was achieved [by Lutheranism] in this respect; nay, we must go further; the Catholics are quite right when they assert that they, not we, lived to see a revival of charitable work in the sixteenth century, and that, where Lutheranism was in the ascendant, social care of the poor was soon reduced to a worse plight than ever before." In Chap. 36 Father Grisar gives us a very learned discussion of the question of Luther's inner life and the psychic problem which it raises. He cites for this purpose the studies of many medical experts, Protestant as well as Catholic. Some of these think he was the victim of occasional fits of downright mania. Father Grisar himself is against this theory, and perhaps rightly, but the evidence unquestionably goes to show that his was a thoroughly abnormal temperament, and it is hard to resist the conclusion that, however morbid was his mentality, its manifestations point to the controlling influence of an evil conscience. Another chapter calls attention to the contradictory nature of Luther's statements about his early life in the monastery, which proves that no importance is to be attached to the testimony he found it convenient in after days to give, perhaps even persuading himself that it was true, as to his having been led by his own sad experiences in those monastic days to recognize the soundness of his doctrine of justification by faith.

After another chapter on the "End of religious freedom," in other words on the conversion of Luther's originally invisible Church of which only the predestined were the members into a State Church under the arbitrary rule of the Protestant German princes, and another on Luther's last days and the true circumstances of his death, so far as they are ascertainable, Father Grisar ends with a discussion of the influence of Luther and the controversies that have arisen as to the classes among the population who are best entitled to be regarded as the heirs of his name and movement, whether the old orthodox Lutherans, or the later Pietists or Rationalists, or the modern liberal theologians, or the still more modern "Apostles of Kultur." In dealing with this final series of problems Father Grisar adheres to his natural disposition to be negative rather than positive in his conclusions, and discloses very little as to the view which commends itself to his

own judgment. But he warns his readers against the tendency to take Luther out of his own age and identify him with movements that did not arise till long after his death.

Of the two Appendices, the first gives a chronological arrangement of Luther's writings, the second gives "Additions and Emendations," relating to certain points in his opinions or actions.

SHORT NOTICES

HISTORICAL.

THE *Chronica Fratris Jordani a Giano* (National Capital Press, Washington) is a thirteenth century Chronicle written by Friar Jordan, one of the earliest sons of the Founder, and giving an account of the first coming of the Friars into Germany. Friar Jordan in this chronicle himself tells under what circumstances it was written, namely in 1262, just after the Chapter of the Order which took place in that year at Halberstadt. Friar Jordan had himself been of the number who were sent to Germany on that occasion of their first entry into the country, and his brethren at Halberstadt had asked him to narrate the story of the event. This he did before he left Halberstadt, Brother Baldwin of Brandenburg taking down the words from his dictation. The history which originated in this authentic manner is a treasure for lovers of St. Francis and his Order, and Father Edwin Auweiler, of the same Order, has determined to bring out a new edition of the Chronicle which shall be of a more popular character than Boehmer's edition, though he fully allows the value of the latter for the use of students. The Dissertation that has been sent us by the National Capital Press of Washington was written that it might be submitted to the Faculty of Letters of the Catholic University of America, with a view to the writer's endeavour to qualify for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The edition itself of the Chronicle is apparently not yet published, and for the general reader a dissertation like this, which is in the form of a Preface and is mostly occupied with matters of manuscript value and textual criticism, is not highly interesting to general readers. But it appears to have been carefully done, and we shall look forward with more interest to the edition of the Chronicle when it comes.

SCRIPTURAL.

The translation published by Dr. Oesterley of *Ecclesiasticus* (*The Wisdom of Ben-Sira*. S.P.C.K. : Price, 2s. 6d. net) will perhaps prove the most important volume of an important series. These translations of early documents, undertaken by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, will doubtless play a considerable part in the development of theological studies, for they place within easy reach of the student evidence which he needs to master, but too often has neglected. The Jewish apocalypses, the earlier rabbinical writings, Philo, Josephus and other such works are indispensable to him who would understand the background of the New Testament. And the *Wisdom of Ben-Sira*, as the editor not ineptly calls *Ecclesiasticus*, gives us an intellectual atmosphere of Jewish philosophy reacting on hellenistic culture, of the Old Testament mind faced by a new

school of thought, which sheds great light on all that St. Paul thought of under the simple words "Jew and Greek." We are rather surprised to find that the editor considers that in general "the book represents, in contrast to the later Pharisaic attitude, the traditional Sadducean religious standpoint." To justify himself, however, he refers to a previous larger work of his own; and we for our part need only note that to us the contrast between traditional Sadducee and later Pharisee appears to be fallacious. If we confine ourselves to the early Pharisee the "contrast" may turn out but a thin one: in general, however, there is little or nothing in the book to which serious exception need be taken. Its special value lies in its taking account of the Hebrew portions of the text that have been recovered. While they are a great help to accuracy, they do not appear to compel any changes of great significance. Indeed, in a work like the present, consisting of more or less detached apophthegms, a couplet more or less makes little difference. The editor, too, is far from rigid in following the obvious textual canons, and sometimes on internal grounds prefers readings which have little authority to recommend them. On the whole, however, he has done his work carefully and well.

The same remarks apply *mutatis mutandis* to the parallel translation of the **Wisdom of Solomon** (S.P.C.K.: 2s. 6d. net) which the same learned author has lately issued. If the version should appear to some needlessly paraphrastic, Dr. Oesterley is always careful to add the literal translation in a footnote. We ourselves should have preferred the text to be literal (except when hopelessly obscure) with only such notes as were necessary for intelligence.

DEVOTIONAL.

The Boyhood of a Priest (Washbourne: 1s. net) by Arnel O'Connor, one of Messrs. Washbourne's dainty little devotional series, is not a biography but a number of informal yet very penetrating talks about vocation and how to preserve it, with, as is natural in the work of a poet, snatches of appropriate verse sandwiched between them. Father W. H. Pollard, Inst. Ch., contributes a stirring Introduction.

In the same series at the same price appears a posthumous work of Father Richard Ratcliffe's, a simple exposition of **Devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus**. Beginning with a short proof of the Divinity of our Lord, the book treats of the essence of the devotion, its characteristics, its advantages and its reward. The devout author could now, we trust, speak with full experience of the last-named effect.

A somewhat larger devotional treatise and one very much older is Père Marie's **Jesus Crucified** (Washbourne: 2s. 6d. net), published originally by its author, a French Jesuit, in 1642, re-edited by Father Grou, S.J., about a century and a half later, reissued once again after another hundred years or so by Father A. Cadrès, S.J., and now translated into English by Mrs. Leggatt. Its sub-title, *The Science of the Cross in the form of Meditations*, indicates its subject and method. The spirituality which it teaches is sound and practical, in spite of its somewhat emotional expression.

POETRY.

Simple metres, no elaboration of harmonies or subtle counter-change of rhyme—what makes Mrs. Meynell's **A Father of Women and other Poems** (Burns and Oates: 2s. net) such a rich uncloying feast for mind and ear? First, the deep and delicate thought born of long pondering on the inner

nature and hidden relations of human experiences; then, the *mot juste*, the storied word calling up not one but many images in itself and its context. Here is thought worthy of the finest clothing: here is expression fitting the thought, perfect in taste, natural and final.

A more robust and louder singer is Mr. Theodore Maynard, whose second slender volume of verse—**Drums of Defeat** (Erskine Macdonald: 1s. net)—lies before us. MONTH readers will recognize many old friends in this collection and will know what to expect from the rest—a singular boldness of conception and picturesqueness of phrase, the work of an artist, not yet perhaps perfectly master of his material, but nowhere dropping into commonplace or merely spinning words. The inclusion of several humorous poems jars rather with the high seriousness and spirituality of the majority. And in one otherwise fine ballade Mr. Maynard falls back shamelessly on what are known as Cockney rhymes—"thawed," "sword," "scored," "gaud," and so forth.

MISCELLANEOUS.

The, happily, temporary drying-up of St. Winefride's Well in North Wales last January gives a singular interest to the **Life of St. Winefride** (C.T.S.: 1s. 3d. net) by Father P. Metcalf, S.J., which Father Thurston has recently edited with Introduction, Appendix, and Notes. The Life originally appeared in 1712, and in itself is a remarkable testimony to the antiquity of the Well as a centre of pilgrimage and to the devotion of Catholics during one of the most hopeless periods of their history in England. It makes, quaint as it is, most edifying reading, for the author atones for his uncritical spirit by abundance of sound moral reflections, whilst *more suo*, the editor sketches most exhaustively the past and present history of the Well and appraises judiciously the details of the Saint's "legend." Altogether it is one of the most interesting of the Society's larger publications.

The God of Battles (Longmans: 1s. net), by Rev. E. C. Crosse, C.F., D.S.O., is a series of unconventional essays, sometimes addressed to the soldier, sometimes to the reader, upon the spiritual experiences of war. The author, who is an Anglican clergyman, has seen fighting at close quarters and knows a great deal about the mentality of that strange agglomeration of beliefs and misbeliefs that makes up the British army. But we should doubt of his qualifications as a moral guide, in spite of his evident earnestness, on the evidence this book affords. He owns, indeed, that the Church of England speaks with an uncertain voice on points of doctrine, so perhaps he cannot be blamed, having no other standard than his "moral sense," for the mistiness of his directions and the obscurity of his views.

We have received from Père L. Laurand, S.J., Docteur ès Lettres, a section of his great **Manuel des Etudes Grecques et Latines** (Picard: 2.00fr.) viz., Fascicule IV., "Géographie, Histoire, Institutions romaines." There are eight parts in all, three devoted to Greece and three to Rome, whilst the other two comprise matter common to both, paleography, epigraphy, etc., and a full collection of Tables. It is a work of immense erudition, yet, judging from the section before us, which deals with the Geography, History, and Institutions of Rome in a compass of 300 pages, very carefully digested for ready assimilation by the scholar. The entire MS. is ready, and the fascicules will appear, subject no doubt to war's vicissitudes, at intervals of three months.

MINOR PUBLICATIONS.

The Abbé de Saint-Laurent has written a consoling little book on the Communion of Saints, which Miss E. Leahy has translated under the title **Our Friendships endure after Death** (Aubanel Bros., Avignon). In this work, which follows the common accredited eschatological teaching of the Church, will be found our grounds for believing that death does not sever the friendships of the good, but renders them the rather more strong and more beneficent. *Fortis est ut mors dilectio.*

A vivid contrast to the sure and certain hope witnessed to in the Abbé's little treatise is the reprint of the lecture on **Human Immortality** (Constable: 7d. net), by the late Professor William James, who approaches the question from the standpoint of pure psychology. He is on the side of the Angels in his own fashion, and devotes his lecture to disposing of two objections against immortality current in agnostic circles, both of which seem to the Christian sufficiently puerile. One is that "thought is a function of the brain," and consciousness therefore must disappear with its decay; the other, that if all human beings survive death, there will be "an incredible and intolerable number" of them! If these are difficulties to any of our readers they may find some sort of solution to them in this little book.

There is a good deal worth considering in Mr. E. C. Beman's pamphlet, **The Cross or the Sword? how to end the War** (Universal Publishing Co.: 6d. net), though its argument is vitiated by the historical fallacy that the Central Powers were not the sole aggressors, and by the ethical fallacy that war is a negation of Christianity, and by the practical fallacy that "non-resistance" is the way to conquer. Mr. Beman rightly insists that we should be careful to clear our own aims and practices of the spirit which we reprobate in our enemies.

A strange medley of agnostic science, eugenics, pantheism, and wild biblical exegesis, called **Looking Forward** (Simpkin, Marshall & Co.: 1s. n.), and written by F. C. M. Welles "of New York City," reaches us from the author. We should ill repay his courtesy by saying in more detail what we think of his pamphlet.

In spite of hard times the output of the C.T.S. does not seem to suffer in quantity or quality. Some ten penny pamphlets, all well worth the printing, are on hand for notice. Of these the most important is Father Richard Downey's **Personal Immortality**, wherein he sets forth the main arguments from reason for this belief. The manner in which he deals with and demolishes in passing the writings of modern sceptics leads us to hope that Father Downey has come to fill the gap left in the ranks of C.T.S. writers by the death of Father John Gerard. Father Vincent Hornyold, S.J., has a familiar theme to treat of in his **Catholic Orders and Anglican Orders**, but he ably marshals the arguments extrinsic and intrinsic against the latter, and points out very clearly the irreformable character of Pope Leo's condemnation of them. Mr. J. F. Scholfield has a still easier task in disposing of **Scottish Anglicanism and its Claims**: whatever may be said for Anglicanism in its native haunts, it is neither fish, flesh, nor fowl in Scotland or Ireland. A somewhat new departure is adopted in **Catholic because Roman Catholic: a Statement and the Reply**, wherein, if we may say so without offence, the antidote is provided along with the poison. An Anglican clergyman states "why though a Catholic in faith and practice, I remain in communion with the Provinces of Canterbury and York."

A priest of the diocese of Westminster in *The Reply* undertakes to show him how mistaken he is. That he has not succeeded in doing so, as shown by a subsequent letter from the Anglican to the *Universe*, is no evidence that his argument is not logically sound and irrefutable: it only shows that the purely Anglican "mind" is somewhat impervious to logic.

St. Bridget of Sweden, by Valentine Paraiso, is a brightly written account of the great mystic and foundress of the Bridgettines of Sion. The ever-growing fiction department receives three welcome additions in **Sunset and Dawn**, by Bertha B. Sutton, **Miss Belinda's Billettee**, by Mother St. Jerome, and **The Case of Edward Smith**, by William Hewlett, a story which clearly develops an argument for Catholicism.

The Society has also published at 3d. a capital Map of **The Catholic Churches of London**, with Index showing the exact situations of the 140 Churches of the Metropolis (80 North and 60 South of the Thames), with railway and tube routes clearly marked. A most useful publication for visitors and for residents also.

The two first numbers of a new **Stories of the Saints** Series for small children completes the tale of an extremely creditable C.T.S. output.

The Catholic Social Guild, in its more limited sphere, is also showing signs of continued activity. Two new volumes in its series of "First Text Books" (Price, 3d. each, n.) have recently been published, viz., No. 2, **The Gospel and the Citizen**, by C. C. Martindale, S.J., and No. 4, **Questions of the Day**, by J. Keating, S.J., and S. Anselm Parker, O.S.B. The former is a brief but very forcible exposition of the effects of our Lord's revelation on social life, and will be appreciated by others besides the school children for which it is primarily intended. The latter is an endeavour to guide youthful minds from the very start to a right consideration of the social problems which they will be called upon to face and to try to solve when they grow up.

But all previous exploits of the C.S.G. have been eclipsed by the surprising success of its penny pamphlet on **The Pope's Peace Note**, wherein was comprised an English version of the actual document with comments intended to put its origin and scope in their true light. Issued at the psychological moment when Catholics were somewhat bewildered by the reception of the Holy Father's proposals, and recommended in a short but weighty Preface by Cardinal Bourne, this pamphlet has in a few weeks reached a circulation of 50,000. The gradual revision by certain journalists of their first hasty impressions of this epoch-making Note may perhaps be partly attributed to this timely action of the Guild.

The Irish C.T.S. has issued a biography of **Captain Roger Bellingham**, written by Mrs. Hinkson, and describing the short, happy, and edifying life-story of one whose death before Ypres in 1915 was not the least of the sacrifices Ireland has made in the cause of freedom.

Four numbers of **The Catholic Mind**, comprising the July and August issues, are on our desk. The first deals with the always-important question of Mixed Marriages, describing their danger, how they can be remedied, and the wisdom of the Church's legislation. The next contains, amongst other valuable matter, the Protest of the American Hierarchy regarding Mexico's anti-Catholic Constitution. The third provides extracts from a Catholic Soldier's Diary—spiritual soliloquies from the pen of a young Italian litterateur and soldier, Giosuè Borsi, who was killed in November, 1915. The last is a reasoned and eloquent defence of the place of Classics

in Education, by Rev. T. A. Murphy, S.J., remarkable for its collection of evidence from a great number of American scholars.

Mr. Joyce Kilmer, now a private in the Seventh Regiment of New York, and still, we make no doubt, a poet, delivered last June an inspiring address on **The Courage of Enlightenment** to the students of Campion College. The speaker makes good his claim that real courage is not blind and that cowardice means intolerance.

Another American utterance inspired by the war reaches us as a reprint from *The American Journal of Sociology*. It is entitled **Americans and the World Crisis**, and its author, Albion W. Small, whilst whole-heartedly supporting his country's ideals in the war, conveys a salutary warning that the real issue is not Democracy *versus* Autocracy, since both forms of government can be aggressive, but the moral law against the "law" of force.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice).

FROM THE AUTHORS.

Our Friendships endure after Death. From the French. By E. Leahy. Pp. 107. *The Courage of Enlightenment.* By Joyce Kilmer. *The "Chronica Fratris Jordani a Giano."* By Rev. E. J. Auweiler, O.F.M. *Looking Forward.* By F. C. M. Welles. Pp. 63. Price, 1s. net.

AMERICA PRESS, New York.
The Catholic Mind. Vol. XV. Nos. 13, 14, 15, 16.

BEAUCHESNE, Paris.
Dictionnaire Apologetique de la Foi Catholique. Fasc. XIII. "Loi Ecclesiastique—Mariolâtrie. Edited by A. d'Alès.

BLOUD ET GAY, Barcelona.
Mi Piesa. By Pablo Lintier. Pp. 308. *Memorias de una Enfermera.* By M. Eyedoux-Démians. Pp. 218.

BURNS & OATES, London.
A Father of Women and other Poems. By Alice Meynell. Pp. 30. Price, 2s. net.

CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, London.
The Life of St. Winefride. Edited by H. Thurston, S.J. Pp. xxii, 122. Price, 1s. 3d. net.
Various Penny Pamphlets.

CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY OF IRELAND, Dublin.
Roger Bellingham. By K. T. Hinkson. Price, 1d.

CHATTO AND WINDUS, London.
Missing! By Mrs. F. E. Penny. Pp. 304. Price, 6s. net.

CONSTABLE & Co., London.
Human Immortality. By W. James. Pp. 126. Price, 7d. net.

ERSKINE MACDONALD, London.

Drums of Defeat and other Poems. By Theodore Maynard. Pp. 76.

LONGMANS, London.

Epistemology. By P. Coffey, Ph.D. 2 Vols. Pp. xiv, 374: viii, 376. Price, 25s. net. *Horace and his Age.* By J. F. D'Alton, M.A. Pp. xii, 296. Price, 6s. net. *The God of Battles.* By Rev. E. C. Crosse, C.F. Pp. 63. Price, 1s. net.

PICARD, Paris.

Manuel des Etudes Grecques et Latines. Fasc. IV. By L. Laurand. Pp. 336. Price, 2.00 fr.

S.P.C.K., London.

Constitution and Enabling Bill. From Report of Archbishops' Committee on Church and State. Price, 3d. net. *Essays Liturgical and Historical.* By J. Wickham Legg. Pp. 182. Price, 5s. net. *The Wisdom of Solomon.* By Rev. W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D. Pp. xxiii, 94. Price, 2s. 6d. net.

UNIVERSAL PUBLISHING COMPANY, Chorley.

The Sword or the Cross? By E. Cecil Beman. Pp. 30. Price, 6d.

WASHBOURNE, London.

Jesus Crucified. By Father Marie, S.J. Translated by L. M. Leggatt. Pp. 195. Price, 2s. 6d. net. *The Boyhood of a Priest.* By Armel O'Connor. Pp. 109. Price, 1s. net. *Devotion to the Sacred Heart.* By R. Ratcliffe, S.J. Pp. 111. Price, 1s. net.

